

THE READER'S DIGEST



"AN ARTICLE A DAY" FROM LEADING
MAGAZINES—EACH ARTICLE OF ENDURING
VALUE AND INTEREST, IN CONDENSED,
PERMANENT BOOKLET FORM



MARCH 1923

Contents

"Keep Your Information Account Open"

Does Anything Come After Death?	3
The Putrid Pen	7
Not for Pleasure Only	9
Psychoanalysis	11
A High Opinion of Oneself	13
What Would Your Solution Be?	15
The High Cost of Government	15
The Menace of Lawless Minorities	16
Why We Should Join the League	17
The Undying Redwood Tree	19
The Dawn Man	21
Politics: Behind the Scenes—1	23
Politics: Behind the Scenes—2	25
Adventures in Arabia	27
Recent Trends of Protestantism	29
The Menace of the Polish Jew	31
"The Eighth Wonder of the World"	35
Duping Financial Babes	37
The Background of India's Millions	39
Changing Conventions and Divorce	41
Tenants Without Landlords	43
"All Wool and a Yard Wide"	45
Restriction in Our Colleges	47
Imperative Educational Reforms	49
Free Speech—A Social Safety-Valve	51
Radicalism vs. Government	53
Men and Half-Men	55
Where Government Operation Works	57
Science and Everyday Life	59
Wild Chairmen I Have Met	61

A Monthly Magazine Digest Service which circulates
to members of the Association

THE READER'S DIGEST ASSOCIATION

Publication Office, Floral Park, New York
Editorial Office, Pleasantville, New York

EDITORS

DeWitt Wallace

Lila Bell Acheson

H. J. Cubberley

25c a copy; \$3.00 a year

Entered as second class matter Oct. 4, 1922, at the
Post Office at Floral Park, N. Y., under act of March
3, 1879. Address all communications to The Reader's
Digest Association, Pleasantville, N. Y.

The Reader's Digest

The Little Magazine

Vol. 2

MARCH 1923

Whole No. 13

Does Anything Come After Death?

Condensed from The American Magazine (March)

An interview with Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D., by Bruce Barton

IN a construction camp in Montana I saw a loaded wagon turn over, burying the teamster beneath. We expected to find him dead; but a projecting rock had intervened, holding the wagon suspended an inch above his face. After leaving the hospital, a few weeks later, I asked him: "Tell me, Sam, when you lay there, expecting any moment to see that rock give way, what did you think about? Did you have any feeling that in another minute you might be standing in front of Almighty God and explaining your sins?"

"Well, no," he answered, "I just lay there lookin' up at that rock, and I seen it weren't a very strong rock. And I says, 'When you slip, old fellow, Sam Hawkins is a dead dog.' And I sort of shut my eyes and I says, 'All right, darn you, slip!'"

I put a similar question to a cultivated middle-aged man who had been at the very threshold of death from pneumonia. "What did you see on the other side? What did you feel?" He answered, "nothing, I had no interest. I was just terribly tired, and I thought, 'Now I can sleep'."

I told these incidents to Dr. Fosdick. "Stories like that don't check up with some sermons I have heard," I said, "sermons based on the assumption that every man has a deep interest in the possibility of eternal life—unexpressed perhaps, but none the less real; and that this interest grows more intense with advancing years, until at the end it becomes a consuming desire."

"I don't think it is true that men are most interested in immortality at the moment of death," said Doctor Fosdick. "Very often men and women meet death like travelers tired out by their journey. Now they are exhausted; they want only to sleep. The man to whom immortality is a vital thing is the strong man in the midst of a great work. It is when we are at our best that we feel immortal and want most to be immortal; not when we are tired out and depressed. The real testing ground is where we find men in the midst of their battles, who stop and ask, 'Is this, after all, a real fight or only a sham battle? Will it make any real difference a hundred years from now whether I win or throw up my hands?'

"For example, a young man was going through a terrible struggle. By

a compromise he could win a very large material reward; the cost was merely a little violence to his conscience. Sitting where you are sitting now, he said to me, 'If I could be sure of immortality, absolutely sure, this thing would be simple!' He meant simply that if his character was really a thing of eternal significance then it was worth the fight, whatever the cost.

"Yes, the craving for immortality is the craving of our finest and best moments. And when you seek for the best arguments for faith you find them coming not from the weak who have failed, but from the greatest whom our race has produced—from Jesus and Socrates, from John Fiske and William James and Doctor Osler, from Cromwell and Stonewall Jackson, from Gladstone and Lincoln—strong men.... You remember the discussion on philosophy which Napoleon carried on with a group of scientists. He listened silently to their arguments and at length, interrupting them crisply, he pointed to the heavens, and exclaimed, 'All that you say may be very true, gentlemen; but tell me who made all that?'

Whenever I see a preacher depicted on the stage or in the movies I think of Harry Emerson Fosdick, and other preachers of my acquaintance, and become exceedingly wroth. I wish the theatrical magnates would visit Doctor Fosdick, take a good look at him, feel the muscles in his forearms, and then rule off the stage forever the milk-and-water, lap-dog type of preacher in whom they have delighted so long.

"Now all our thinking about immortality must commence with some such question it seems to me. Some Power made this world. Is it more reasonable to think that this Power is purposeful Intelligence, or to think that it is dynamic dirt going it blind? Everywhere that science turns its microscopes or its telescopes it finds the unmistakable evidence of order. Even Huxley, agnostic as he was, admitted that, saying, 'As for

the strong conviction that throughout all duration unbroken order has reigned in the universe, I not only accept it but I am disposed to think it is the most important of all truths.' The universe is a real universe, not a conglomeration of planets made of different stuff and acting according to diverse laws. The chemical elements of the farthest star whose light passes through our spectrum are the same as the elements which compose our earth and sun. The universe is everywhere amenable to thought; it is trustworthy, not capricious. This means that the world acts as it might be expected to act if it had been thought through by Mind. When Charles Darwin exclaimed, 'If we consider the whole universe, the mind refuses to look at it as the outcome of chance,' he is saying that the cosmic process is rational and that nothing comes by accident. When Science, searching the universe, finds no exceptions, no mistakes, but everywhere rationality, thought, how shall we explain that thought without a Thinker? No atheist scientist has ever answered that question.

"So of the two hypotheses, the theory that the universe merely happened seems to me the less reasonable, the harder to believe; and every forward step of Science increases the difficulty of believing it. Being at variance with all our experience it requires the larger measure of credulity. If there be no intelligence behind the universe, then matter has created something greater than itself—for we ourselves are intelligent. How much easier, more rational it is to believe that our personalities are not a product of something less than themselves, but parts of a greater Personality whom some have called the First Cause, some Mind, and some God.

"The second step logically follows. If there be a Personality behind the universe, what sort of personality is it? We see this creation moving up from low to higher forms, from a chaos of star dust to an ordered

universe of stars and planets; on the earth, from inorganic to organic, from crystal, to vegetable, to human, until at last there comes the summation of it all—*personality*. If this evolving universe has been headed toward anything, it has been headed toward personality. Can we suppose that, having finished this agonizing task, having completed at last His purpose—*personality*—God would toss it on the scrap heap, as though He did not care for it at all, as though what He had wrought by the agony of a million years was but the caprice of a careless, passing whim? Darwin, who gave us our great vision of evolution, revolted from that idea. 'It is an intolerable thought that man and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation, after such long-continued slow progress!' he exclaimed.

'In India, they tell us, there are fakirs who sit beside pools of water with piles of colored dust beside them, and with skilful ingenuity drop the dust upon the quiet surface and make for the observer portraits of distinguished characters. Then the breeze ruffles the pool and the picture disappears. . . . Is that God's business? He takes the colored dust, drops it on the quiet surface of Life's water, and lo! a Lincoln. Then the breeze blows and all the dust is gone. Or He takes the dust and makes Christ, with a spirit so exalted that He could surrender this life gladly, with unwavering faith in another. Then, the breeze; and again all the dust is gone. . . . Is God only such an Indian fakir? Does a reasonable person build a violin, with infinite labor gathering the materials and shaping the body, until upon it he can play the compositions of the masters, only to smash it into bits? Professor Palmer, writing of the death of his wife, said: 'Who can contemplate and not call the world irrational, if out of deference to a few particles of disordered matter, it excludes so fair a spirit?' That beautifully expressed, is the thought of every man and woman of

fine intelligence beside the grave of one whom they love. Is the Personality that has given us the possibility of such thoughts less good, less kind, less reasonable than ourselves?

"Admit, as Science does, that the universe is rational, and how can you escape from God? Assume God, and how shall you escape the assurance of the survival of His choicest creation, human personality? True, in old age, we see both minds and bodies decay. But is the body or the brain the man? Or is it merely an instrument which the man has used and has at last worn out? Just as it requires infinite credulity to believe that the universe was created by chance, so it requires infinite credulity to believe that we are creations of our brains. The lobes of the brain are made up of physical cells, connected by innumerable avenues of nerve communication. How can these cells be pictured as conspiring to write Hamlet or to compose the sonatas of Beethoven? Has each cell a mental aspect? If each cell has, how can it communicate its mental power, and arrange with its neighbors to contribute theirs, so that together they shall produce an Emancipation Proclamation, or a determination to die on Calvary rather than be untrue? The thing is inconceivable. Our brains are not ourselves. Our bodies are not ourselves. They are merely the instruments which we use. They are the scaffolding erected for the building of the greatest thing in the world—*personality*. The scaffolding is necessary; without it the building cannot be carried on. But the time comes when the scaffolding is no longer necessary, when it can be torn down, leaving the personality to stand alone.

"Men say to me, 'But I can't imagine a human being existing without a body.' And I answer them; 'If you are going to rule out as impossible all the things that strain your imagination, you are going to fall far behind the march of present-day science.' The scientist tells me that the head of a common pin is a

universe, that inside it millions of atoms move in regular cycles, like the planets in the sky. I have seen it stated that two hundred and fifty thousand years would be required to count the atoms in the head of a pin. To me this is inconceivable; yet I do not reject the scientist's assurance as untrue because I find difficulty in imagining it. So with conditions after death—because they are hard to imagine is no reason to doubt their reality. Suppose an Eskimo, whose whole experience with vegetation is confined to a few lichens or bits of moss, were asked to imagine the African jungle, how could he possibly conceive it? Yet our knowledge of the whole of life is as fragmentary as the Eskimo's knowledge of botany. We have only in the last few years begun to discover anything at all about the mysteries of the universe. Surely it need not discourage us if we find it difficult to imagine conditions in the unseen world as created and guided by an Infinite Intelligence.

"It was a great day in my mental experience when I suddenly realized that I had never really seen my own mother, and that she had never really seen me. I knew and loved every detail of her features, every tone of her voice, every glance of her eye. Yet it dawned upon me like a great light one day that these were not herself; that love, consciousness, mercy, thought, affection, hope, charity—all her real attributes—were as invisible to me as God himself. There is this mystery in every human conversation: each of us is invisible just as invisible as God. Today, we are citizens of this unseen world; tomorrow we shall not have changed our citizenship; we shall merely have been given eyes to see each other as we really are, and to see Him.

"I repeat that the stronger men are, the more surely they lay hold upon faith in immortality. It *makes a difference* whether men and women believe in immortality. That is not an academic question; it is a matter which relates itself very definitely

to their powers of doing worth-while things. One of the most futile men of our father's generation was one of the most gifted and best educated—but he accomplished almost nothing. Why? Because his mind let itself be poisoned by the feeling of futility; because whenever he essayed a real man's task, the deadening spirit of Doubt would stand before him asking with a sneer, 'What's the use of it all?' Of course, he accomplished nothing! Such men never do.

"It does make a difference *whether* you believe and *what* you believe. Religion is not a thing apart from life; it *is* life. Given the trained soldiers of King Charles on the one side, with their cynical contempt, and the consecrated peasants behind Cromwell, fired with faith in their cause, and there can be only one outcome. Faith carries men to the top; it gives them the sense of Something infinitely worth-while behind them.

"I wrote a little book once on prayer. The president of a great corporation sent for five hundred copies, and gave one to each of his salesmen. 'I want you to read this book,' he wrote. 'I don't care what your religion may be' (there were Jews, Gentiles, Catholics, Protestants, agnostics, among them); 'never mind the theology in the book, but get the message. If you can get a real grip on a Faith like that we will have our greatest year yet.'

"His idea was right. There are only two alternatives: Either the whole universe is a whim, or caprice—purposeless, rudderless, and doomed to destruction; or else there is a God behind it all, watching the battle, guiding it, managing the whole creation as a vast mechanism for the production of Personality and Character, which are eternal.

"You can take your choice. But don't imagine that it makes no difference what or how you think. It is not by chance that the great men of the world have been believing men. They were great because they had the courage and imagination to believe greatly."

The Putrid Pen

Condensed from *How to Live* (March)

(Published by the Life Extension Institute, New York)

ALFRID NOYES, the British poet who has endeared himself to the world at large has also endeared himself to the scientific world by his poem "The Torch Bearers," portraying the progress of astronomy, and to those who are interested in mental health, by leaping with white hot fury on the noisome literary gang who foster putrid literature. Listen to what he said before the Royal Society of Literature recently—and remember that he is not a professional reformer or puritanical preacher, but a poet, a man alive to the legitimate privileges of art:

"A book was recently published. In the current number of the 'Quarterly Review' there is a review—an exceedingly able review—of this work, which I say without hesitation, and without the slightest fear that anyone here who has seen it will disagree with me, is the foulest that has ever found its way into print. There is no foulness conceivable to the mind of madman or ape that has not been poured into its imbecile pages. It has been suppressed by the police, and is being smuggled into this country from Paris at five guineas. My attention was first called to it by a column and a half in a leading newspaper, where it was said to be eagerly awaited by select literary circles. The writer said that its very obscenity was somehow beautiful and 'if this is not high art, what is?' A weekly journal followed with eight columns, in which the book was compared with Goethe's 'Faust.' A leading novelist said that Mr. —, the author, had only just missed being the most superb novelist of all time and proclaimed him to be a 'genius.' Writer after writer took up the word,

until — and genius seemed to be almost synonymous. Yet the technical quality of the book is beneath contempt, and large sections of it are simply unspeakably degraded. No word or thought conceivable in the gutters of Dublin or the New York Bowery is omitted, and the foul references are made to real persons in this country, attributing vile diseases to them, amongst other equally foul suggestions. There is no criminal court in this country which would not brand the book as inexpressibly degraded; and yet, only last night, in a leading newspaper, I see — referred to as one of our masters. Weighing every word, I say that, whether we know it or not, this is nothing less than a national disgrace; a disgusting blot upon our national heritage.

"I have cited the extreme case of this book, because it is a complete reduction to absurdity of what I have called the literary Bolshevism of the hour. . . Genius! What do these men know of genius?—genius speaking not through the lips of those whom the sophisticated would choose, but through the lips of the child, and the lover, and the poet. I open the pages of Tennyson whom they delight to dishonor, as having no word for our own time, and I read:

"The year's at the Spring,
The day's at the Morn,
Morning's at seven,
The hill-side's dew-pearled,
The lark's on the wing,
The snail's on the thorn.
God's in his heaven,
All's right with the world."

"That is genius! The power in eight lines, to reintegrate a disordered world, by relating all its scattered

and fragmentary tones to the central and eternal harmony.

"The literature of the world today reflects as a matter of course the world's confusion. It can be said with perfect truth that never in the history of the world was there a time so fraught with danger to everything that makes life worth living, or civilization worth defending; and yet never was there a time of such immense possibilities and hope.

"We talk of giving the new generation its opportunity, and our cynics are laying upon its shoulders the heaviest and dreariest burden that the young have ever been called upon to bear. We are telling them that dust ends all, and they are not always able to summon up that vast cloud of witnesses which in all ages has declared the contrary. The quietness and sadness of many of the more thoughtful young today arises from that bitterest and most desolate feeling of the human heart—'They have taken away my Master, and I know not where they have laid Him.'

It is well for some one from the literary world to speak out and denounce these literary pretenders, whether authors or critics, who are seeking a short-cut to money and notoriety through filth. If the people could only be made to understand that such wretched stuff is really the product of diseased minds or else of deliberate conscienceless effort to sell something regardless of its harmful influence, such books would not be read and discussed with a knowing air by people who like to be regarded as connoisseurs. It is a curious fact that authors, publishers and critics can enter one's home through such channels and insult one's family by language which, if personally delivered, would land them outside in the hands of a policeman as disorderly

characters. When such books, which no healthy-minded individual would dare to read aloud in a family even with only fair moral standards, are attacked and their suppression demanded, what maudlin tears are shed in behalf of personal liberty!

The author of the book denounced by Noyes is still at large and featured by a leading magazine. Such authors are as menacing to the public, especially in this age of shifting moral standards, as a typhoid carrier. A person may recover from typhoid, but a mind affected by a rotten and decadent philosophy of life and continually fed on evil suggestions from minds with a pathological trend, may live out many spoiled years, transformed as to personality, and a secondary focus of moral and mental infection. What a pity it is that the human mind and soul is not something tangible that can be taken out and washed with hot soapsuds and water and hung out to dry. . . . The best way to suppress such literature is to avoid it. Don't let these wretched literary sneak-thieves get your money, your time, or your thoughts. Turn from the neurotic drivel that passes for literature, for the following noble lines from Noyes' "Torch Bearers"—a message to all mankind, whether scientist or churchman:

"Oh, holy night, deep night of stars,
whose peace
Descends upon the troubled mind like
dew,
Healing it with a sense of that pure
reign
Of constant law, enduring through all
change;
Shall I not, one day, after faithful
years,
Find that thy heavens are built on
music, too,
And hear, once more, above thy throb-
bing worlds
This voice of all compassion, Comfort
ye,—
Yes—comfort ye, my people, saith
your God?"

An announcement regarding permanent binders for
The Reader's Digest will be made next month.

Not for Pleasure Only

Condensed from *The Theatre Magazine* (March)

Channing Pollock

It is interesting to note how closely Mr. Pollock's discussion supports Gene Stratton-Porter's statements, reported in the February Digest, concerning recent significant trends in the motion-picture industry.

IT'S a curious thing—this idea of "entertainment." The playhouse, everyone tells us, is and should be "a place of entertainment." Nobody persists that the Metropolitan Opera House should be "a place of entertainment," or the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Nobody wants to devote Carnegie Hall to recitals of songs by Irving Berlin.

But, conceding the need of "entertainment," and that the playhouse is the place for it, why must we concede that entertainment is to be provided only by what is obvious and vulgar? Don't people laugh in their libraries with Mark Twain and J. M. Barrie, and, if there aren't as many of these as laugh at the comic supplements, do we turn over our best publishing houses to the issuance of comic supplements?

Theatrical promoters have claimed that there aren't enough people who laugh at a really witty line and who thrill at a big idea. But how do they know? Somebody asked a celebrated divine whether he admitted that Christianity had been a failure, and he replied that it had never been tried. Until very recently, has there been any evidence that an appeal to intelligent people has ever been tried largely in the theatre?

My latest play, "The Fool," was foredoomed by the critics, who assert-

ed that no great percentage of the population was even mildly interested in the question whether, in this day, it was possible for anybody to live like Christ. The overwhelming majority of the population, according to the theatre managers, were occupied exclusively with crooks, harlots, and adultery. To the utter amazement of these diagnosticians, a very great percentage of the population has manifested its concern in the problem of this play, and in the questions discussed in "Loyalties," and "R. U. R.," and "Rain," and "Seventh Heaven." These are the great financial successes today in New York. One after another, the stencilled, stereotyped, cheap and obvious, false and unobservant muck-rakings about "crooks" and "harlots"—the chief reliance of the theatre these many moons—have come into town, and, after a brief period of neglect, have folded their tents like the Arabs and as silently stolen away.

The truth is that the intelligent people, the cultured people, long alienated, are coming back. For a considerable time, a little group of managers in control gave the public what they thought it wanted and understood, which was only what they wanted and understood. Men who had never read a book in their lives, or attended a lecture, who hadn't the faintest idea what people were thinking, because they never really thought themselves; produced for themselves, and imagined they were producing for the thinking public. At the end of that time, there was no thinking public that ever dreamed of going to the theatre. The better grade of professional man or merchant tried it once, and found himself condemned to

listen for three hours to an infantile love story or to witness a reflection of life as it never was, and never could be, and then—stayed home! After that, when he had three hours to give, and the money to spend, he attended a lecture, or a concert, or remained at home and read something in his library.

All the time this certain group of managers was insisting that there was no public for good plays they were obliged to admit that somehow, there was an unprecedentedly large public for lectures and recitals. But they never looked for the answer. Now and then a good play was produced and failed, and then the mighty chorus said: "You see!" It was as though a newspaper that had published a comic supplement every Sunday for years suddenly issued, instead, the reproduction of an etching by Whistler. When none of the newspaper's readers showed any interest in the etching, the publisher cried: "There is no public for Whistler." Whereas the fact was that all the public that cared for Whistler had stopped reading that particular newspaper.

A very considerable proportion of theatregoers—I'm not sure that they do not constitute the majority—derive "entertainment" from the exercise of the mental faculties, instead of from their suspension. A very considerable proportion do not check their brains with their hats, and go home satisfied to take nothing with them but the program. They want something more than idle laughter as a return for their evenings. They know about the big questions of the day, and are more vitally interested in them, than in discovering whether the lady's husband will find her gloves upon the sofa and deduce that his best friend hasn't spent the afternoon playing cribbage.

With the coming of new blood, and new brains, of a new kind of manager into the little group, it has been made manifest that the things that the people think about, talk about,

and read about, are the things they want to hear about in the theatre. The manager who, six years ago, advertised his attraction as offering "nothing to think about, nothing to learn, no uplift—just 100 per cent entertainment," was not only vicious, but stupid. How can a thinking person be entertained without having anything to think about?

Anyway, it seems to be self-evident that a man owes something to the theatre in his community, as he owes something to the government. That three hours we've been talking about is almost half of a working day. A man owes it to himself and his tribe to use such a treasure wisely, and for the general good. Whatever he does that lowers the intellectual standard of his neighborhood is as bad as what he may do to lower its moral standard. I have always thought it queer that we ostracize the physical prostitute, who harms only herself and a few others, and not the mental prostitute, who has a far greater range of influence. That we jail the person who buys liquor, instead of the person who buys a bad picture, or seats for a bad play. Personally, I don't see any particular difference between the man who goes to the brothel, for one kind of physical pleasure, and the man who goes to a pornographic play for the same kind of mental pleasure.

We try to encourage the placing of fine statuary in our parks, and of fine paintings in our galleries; why shouldn't we feel some duty as to the production of fine plays on our stages? Why should we permit in our theatre the same story we would think contemptible in our libraries?

The realest, and truest, and most enduring pleasure is the mental and spiritual exhilaration that comes of seeing and hearing a noble thing. Above the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, is the inscription: "Not for Pleasure Only." Wouldn't that be a pretty good inscription for us? Can any of us really afford those things which are "for pleasure only"?

The Reader's Digest

Psychoanalysis

Condensed from *The Catholic World* (Feb.)

Charles Bruehl, Ph.D.

WITHIN a remarkably short time, psychoanalysis has become a fashion and a cult with a numerous body of ardently devoted followers. It was proposed by Dr. S. Freud, a prominent Vienna nerve specialist, as a new method for the cure of various mental disorders, but it rapidly developed into a psychological system aiming at the explanation of all human activities. It affords a plausible and specious interpretation of the psychic life of man calculated to captivate the unthinking, and by its elaborate show of scientific profoundness is devised to catch the fancy and to impress the judgement of the many. Eminent neurologists not only belittle its merits, but see in it a menace and a danger.

The basic contention of the psychoanalysts is, that in the unconscious part of man's mind there exist forces, urges, and impulses, which are at cross-purposes with his conscious life, and which though unknown and concealed, exercise a paramount influence on his conscious activities and determine his decisions, emotional attitudes, and external actions, though he is not aware of this fact. Freud concludes that mental disturbances and hysterical phenomena—unreasonable likes or dislikes, violent outbursts of passion without adequate motive, various dreads and fears, obsessions and manias of different kinds—have their origin in some forgotten emotional experience that completely eludes the present knowledge of the sufferer. This original emotional shock is known as soul-wound. This experience dropped completely out of consciousness, and yet, subconsciously it continues to exert a disturbing influence in the psychic life of the individual. The experience had

been purposely ejected from the consciousness on account of its unpleasant, revolting, and immoral nature. No morbid symptoms would have resulted, had the occasion been deliberately faced and overcome by reasoning or proper emotional reaction. But mere repression leads to psychic troubles.

A cure can be effected if the submerged idea or memory (complex) is again brought to light and deprived of its sinister influence. But there are difficulties to be reckoned with. The guilty complex is unknown to the patient, and its unearthing is a laborious task requiring great skill and infinite patience. Consequently, a complicated technique had to be elaborated in order to trick the offending complex into self-betrayal. One of these devices is the word-reaction method, in which the patient is tested by his responses to a list of carefully selected stimuli-words. Besides, the whole life of the patient is subjected to a minute scrutiny; his idiosyncrasies, mannerisms, embarrassments, and unaccountable likes and dislikes are made the subject of detached study, for they are all, in some way, leakings from the unconscious, and hence may assist in the discovery of the hidden complex.

The chief means, however, to get at the stored contents of the unconscious is the dream. Through it, we obtain glimpses of things which at all other times are carefully screened from view. Every dream is the fulfillment of a suppressed wish, still lurking in the unconscious but, by reason of its unconventional or immoral character, not daring to manifest itself in its real form, therefore appearing in some disguise. Hence arises a very intricate dream symbolol-

ism which must be deciphered, if the real meaning of the dream is to be disclosed.

A cure cannot be regarded as complete and final until the emotional energy, liberated by the destruction of the complex, is directed to some beneficial end and turned into useful channels. In this process, a dangerous urge, a misdirected passion, may be not only rendered harmless, but converted into a potency for good. This is excellent pedagogy, but it cannot be claimed by the psychoanalysts as an original discovery of their own. It is, in fact, an axiom recognized by all educators, who regard mere repression as baneful and extremely dangerous.

The mind, according to psychoanalysts is divided into two main sections: the conscious and the unconscious. The conscious needs no explanation. All around it lies the wide realm of the unconscious, and its terrific dynamic energy is supplied, Freud says, from the basic sex impulse that impels all animate creation — whence the predominantly erotic tone of psychoanalytic literature, which is so offensive to the normal reader. In the region of the unconscious dwell the primitive instincts that dominated the cave man, but which civilization has outlawed, and which now growl and sulk in their cavernous depths. The unconscious is a terrible prison that holds the things that are incompatible with culture and civilization; it is a storehouse of enormous energy, since the things that are there constantly try to break forth and overflow into the conscious. Some men are not equal to the continual strain, the unconscious breaks through and begins to interfere with the conscious activity of the unfortunate individual, and makes him either a criminal or a neurotic. The repression exercised by the individual must not be confounded with deliberate self control. From that it is separated by an impassable gulf, for the psychoanalytic repression

is an unconscious activity. . . . The idea is almost humorous—especially from a scientist. The theory of dream symbolism is equally unwarranted.

As a therapeutic method, psychoanalysis has not yet proved its claims. The cures it has effected are likely due rather to a candid disclosing of the patient's troubles, elicited by the sympathetic interest of the physician, to a general reorientation of the mental life, and, especially to a deliberate and patient training of the will.

Since the psychoanalyst is convinced that every neurosis has its origin in a maladjustment of sex life, and insists on prying into the most remote memories of the heart, it is difficult to see how the subject can avoid catering to sex curiosity. It goes without saying that a treatment fraught with so much danger should be applied only by an experienced and reputable physician. The use of psychoanalysis as a pastime deserves the severest strictures, and must be condemned as immoral, because it fosters morbid self-introspection, creates sex obsessions. The mind is a delicate and nicely balanced mechanism; if tampered with, it takes bitter revenge. However, it is true that psychoanalysis has increased our experimental knowledge of certain mental processes; it has laid the foundations of a scientific sex psychology, such as is needed by the criminologist and the neurologist. The popularity of psychoanalysis is largely owing to the blatant advertising of its champions and the prurient appeal of its literature. There is no excuse for the threshing out of sexual perversions in books intended for popular consumption.

The creed of the psychoanalyst is the omnipotence of the unconscious. Men are not responsible agents, who control their own actions or think their own thoughts. They themselves are only marionettes, moved from behind the scene, where the unconscious holds absolute sway.

A High Opinion of Oneself

Condensed from The Ladies' Home Journal (March)

Harry Emerson Fosdick

AN old Edinburgh weaver used habitually to pray, "O God, help me to hold a high opinion of myself." One imagines behind that Scotchman's life such a home as Burns described in The Cotter's Saturday Night, where the profound meanings of religion and right living were bred into the very marrow of the children. In sharp contrast, stand the bandits who disgrace our cities, to whom nothing is sacred. They murder for a song, lie with ease, betray their friends without a qualm.

Every admirable character in history can be interpreted in terms of lofty self-respect. If Joseph resists impurity it is because he thinks that his honor is sacred. If martyrs have gone to the stake rather than lie it is because they have believed that their truth is sacred.

The one abiding service which a fine home can do the children is to put deep down into the grain of them the consciousness that in themselves is something sacred, rather than violate which they would better die. The old admonitions will one day have been forgotten, but the home will have given the children something deeper, a sure and sensitive taste which loves good and shrinks from evil, which feels instinctively that life's spiritual values, its purities and fidelities and truths are too fine to be profaned. The mere denunciation of our young people, thundering against them the penalties of the moral law, does little good. The deeper trouble with all of us, both older and younger, is not that we lack knowledge of the certain external penalties, but that we lack a fine sense of inward sanctities. A quick sense of possessing in ourselves

something inwardly fine that must not be desecrated is essential to great character. It is one of the supreme gifts that any home can give to its children. It is generally caught by contagion, not taught by admonition. Ex-president Eliot says that the strongest appeal to wayward boys consists in making clear to them how much they have been sacrificed for and how much their failure would mean to those who cared. Every man who has had a great mother understands that long after her special words have been forgotten her abiding influence consists in an immeasurable heightening of life's sacredness. He has been sacrificed for, and he feels that his life is worth too much to be thrown away.

Because of their insight men have seen that life is finer and more meaningful than they had supposed. To have friends whose lives we can elevate or depress by our influence is sacred. To be intrusted with little children is sacred. To have powers by which we can make this earth a more decent place is sacred. To be a child of God is sacred. And honesty, fidelity and love are sacred. Such is the insight by which high-minded parents have trained high-minded children.

The need of such self-respect in modern life is not far to seek. There used to be a barn on the crest of the Chautauqua hills so placed that its ridgepole was a watershed between two great river systems, one flowing into the Atlantic, and the other into the Gulf of Mexico. We boys used to be fascinated wondering at the farrander destinies of the drops which fell so near together. Such a decisive element in character is this mat-

ter of self-respect. To have it in good working order and on short notice is generally the determining factor in a man's life. The life is smirched, defiled, perhaps ruined, before there has been time to think. Only those men get through unscathed by dishonor in whom self-respect is ingrained, in whom lies that inextinguishable resentment against sacrilege which rises up even at the last moment to cry, "No, before God—not that!" This fine expression of the spirit is contained in Tennyson's ascription to the queen: "O, loyal to the royal in thyself." All greatness of character is associated with that—"loyal to the royal in thyself."

One field where this test of character has application is the relationship between the sexes. Out of an old-fashioned reticence we have come into an age where we discuss everything blatantly. It is true that the sunlight of wholesome knowledge can disperse the fogs of morbid curiosity, and all movements to bring that about are salutary. But that is no excuse for what is happening today. Our fathers used to witness the public execution of criminals. It was thought the sight of punishment would teach the people a lesson. But it did no such thing. Penologists learned that after public executions murders and other crimes increased. They discovered that "brutality begets brutality." In consequence, we keep our executions behind closed doors. So, too, it is arrant nonsense to suppose that our unashamed and vociferous sex interest, our sex dramas, novels, films, and sex caricatures of psychoanalysis, with all their information, are helping to cleanse the life of our youth. They do not waken the aspiration for purity; they accustom it to impurity. We cannot wash our linen clean in dirty water. The ultimate protection of youth against uncleanness lies in an inbred respect for life's sanctities. Without that, no information matters; with it, it is surprising what admirable results previous generations with all their reticence often obtained.

When we were children and had to cross a creek on a single log we learned that if we looked down at the swirling water underneath we would likely fall in. But if we held our heads up to look at a tree upon the other bank we could walk across. The present generation, in dealing with the sex problem, are endlessly called to look down. "Look down," cry the books. "Consider how appalling impurity is!" "Look down," cry the plays. "Consider the terrible aftermath of impurity!" Is it not about time that more voices were raised telling the young people to look up?

The positive ideal of a clean life that holds a high opinion of itself is youth's ultimate protection. Recall Phillips Brooks words: "To keep clear of concealment or of the need of concealment, to do nothing which he might not do on the middle of Boston Common at noonday—I cannot say how more and more that seems to me to be the glory of a young man's life. It is an awful hour when the first necessity of hiding anything comes. Put off that day as long as possible. Put it off forever if you can." Self-respect like that establishes an instinctive quarantine in the mind, and nothing is more needed today among our youth.

One reason why it is of vital concern to every citizen, whatever his special form of religious belief, that real religion should flourish is that religion has always taught men thus to respect life's sanctities. Religion has always been saying about something, "This must not be desecrated." True, it may have been only a painted stick, a hideous idol, an altar red with sacrificial blood. Yet even in its crude and cruel forms religion has been doing humanity this service. No civilization will long survive without that conviction that something in life is so sacred that a man would better die than have it violated. When that conviction appears in its finest form it lifts life to its highest levels. Christianity at its best teaches men to hold a very lofty opinion of themselves. And one of the most important problems of our time is the maintenance of this high estimate of human life against the devastating effects of a materialistic philosophy. The final result of materialism is to strip all sanctity from life, reduce everything to the activity of physical atoms, make human spirits helpless cogs in a gigantic mechanism, and in the end to present a picture of humanity born of the dust, doomed to the dust, without spiritual origin, spiritual meaning or spiritual destiny. That undercuts everything that is excellent and beautiful in humanity. Many people treat religion as a negligible matter. The fact is that religion is fighting the battle for something indispensable to human welfare, for life can be either consecration or desecration. And no test of character goes much deeper than the decision as to which of these two it shall be.

What Would Be Your Solution?

Problems Confronting the American People for Which Intelligent Solutions Must Be Found

Car of Potatoes Brings \$1.30

The Outlook (Feb. 28) contains a photographic reproduction of a check received by a farmer in Leal, North Dakota, for a car-load of potatoes and of the bill for expenses in getting the potatoes to market. The potatoes were sold in Minneapolis for \$336, (80 cents per cwt.) by the Minnesota Potato Exchange who charged off from this amount the following items, sending the farmer a check for \$1.30.

Selling commission	\$42.00
Inspection	4.00
Option, at 7c	29.40
Freight, at 43c	180.60
Heater detention	2.00
Freight investigate	28.20
Allowance A-c quality.....	21.00
Shrinkage, 3630 lb.	27.22
Scale28
 Total charges	\$334.70
Check to balance	1.30

A North Dakota farmer comments on the sale as follows:

"It will be noted that the car was originally sold for 80 cents per 100 pounds, so that the potatoes must have arrived in fairly good shape. Yet Mr. Nelson gets but \$1.30 in payment for all his work of planting, cultivating, digging, hauling, and sorting. And he had to pay for his seed and sacks besides. The sacks in this car-load cost between \$30 and \$40. Several other cars of potatoes shipped from North Dakota have brought returns of less than \$10."

The H. C. of G.

One person out of every 20 gainfully employed works for the government—federal, state, city and county. This gigantic machine of government calls for between an eighth and

a seventh of all that everyone in the United States obtains, for his labor. The national income has been estimated by varying authorities at about sixteen billions of dollars; and our national upkeep is nearly eight and a half billions.

If evenly distributed among the workers of the country, the per capita cost of government would approximate \$210. If we should have to pay our taxes in labor—and, of course, in the last analysis that is just how we do pay it—every man and woman, every working boy and girl over 10 years of age, would labor one day out of every seven and a fraction, free of all compensation, as his share of the upkeep of government. About seven weeks a year every year, of work without compensation for the privileges and protection accorded us by government. These estimates are conservative; they understate the case rather than exaggerate it.—The Nation's Business (March), Published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Menace of Lawless Minorities

In the freedom of a democratic State strong differences of opinion develop among individuals or groups as to what is just and right in private, class or public action; and these inevitable differences are apt to become hot and threatening. How has the American democracy dealt with them? By laying down the rule that the majority of votes shall determine action, and enforcing that rule as soon as the majority is ascertained. Because democracy in this country has usually observed that rule, democracy has made more and safer progress than anywhere else.

Two flagrant violations of this invaluable principle have lately attracted attention, but not enough: first, the filibustering performance in the United States Senate whereby two or three Senators, or even one, can prevent the adoption of legislation known to be acceptable to both Senate and House, merely by talking against time; and secondly, the successful resistance to the execution of the Volstead act by a minority of the total population. Both these violations of the majority rule are deplorable; but they are not hard to remedy, and are probably teaching a useful lesson on unsound democratic practices. Lynching and the operations of the Ku Klux Klan supply other examples of minority lawlessness.—Dr. Charles Eliot in *Current History* (March).

The first trial of men for the Herin Massacre has ended, as was not altogether unexpected, in acquittal, but the same men are to be retried on other capital charges, and there are others awaiting trial. Meantime prosecution of men suspected of Ku Klux Klan murders at Mer Rouge, Louisiana, is in progress, with results not at this writing to be forecast. Whatever may be the final outcome in either case, these facts are indelibly seared upon the national consciousness: That in these two places remotely separated from each other, among people, in circumstances, and for causes as widely different as can be imagined, were committed with studied deliberation two of the most atrocious tragedies that sully the annals of man, with details so revolting that no paper nor official report could set them down in print. Someone is

guilty, and should be punished. To say that such things could be done, in two of the oldest and most important States of this Union, and nobody be brought to book for them, would be to impeach American civilization. . .

An interesting coincidence is observed in the course of some labor organizations toward two recent tragedies. In Illinois a lawless mob of labor unionists tortured and murdered a number of non-unionists; whereupon labor unions all over the land moved for the raising of an immense fund for the defense of all who should be accused and put on trial for the crime. Later, in Arkansas, a lawless mob of non-unionists tortured some unionists and murdered at least two of them; whereupon labor unions all over the land moved for the raising of an immense fund for the prosecution of those charged with the crime. Perhaps this is merely an application to labor unions of a perverted interpretation of the famous toast to "Our Country," made to read "Our unions, right or wrong!" The most unfortunate phase of the matter is the inclination it indicates toward injecting class interests into the administration of justice. Class legislation is thoroughly evil; but class enforcement of the laws would be to make an end of all law and justice. Of course, labor unionists, who are generally intelligent and law-abiding men and women, do not intend any such abominable thing. But they do themselves injustice by too great readiness to regard every accused unionist as innocent just because he is a unionist, and every accused non-unionist as guilty just because he is a non-unionist.—Editorials, *North American Review* (March).

A school superintendent of New Jersey writes: "I have learned to look forward to the arrival of the Digest with the greatest of pleasure. I consider myself fortunate to have been able to enroll as one of the Charter Members of the Association. Every opportunity I get I sing the praises of *The Reader's Digest*. It is the best magazine that comes to my attention each month. I would not know how to get along without it."

Why We Should Join the League

Condensed from Our World (March)

Justice John H. Clarke

A NY refuge, any experiment even would be better than to go blindly, hopelessly, forward into another World War. If we remain out of the League the next war will come, as the last one did, without our having any opportunity to prevent it and with only the privilege of fighting our way out of it. But even worse—for us to remain out of the League is definite notice to the 52 civilized nations now members of it, that we prefer to settle our differences with them in the old savage way of war rather than by resort to this new agency of peace.

The usual objection to our joining the League is that such membership would constitute an "entangling alliance" with European nations and would involve sending our youth to fight abroad. Is this true? Stripped of irrelevancies, membership would impose upon us only four obligations of any consequence. First, we should agree not to make war on any other member of the League until time had been given for a hearing of the differences involved, and for three months after the report of such a hearing should be published. As our Government is a party to more than 20 treaties with all of the important League powers, each containing precisely such a provision as this for delay, certainly this obligation would not constitute for us an "entangling alliance."

Second, we should agree to consider the plans which the Council of the League may prepare for the reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national and international safety. We should have the unqualified right to reject such plans, but if we accepted them we should

be bound by them for four years. It is obvious that only distrust of our Government to so judge of such plans as to take care of our own interests can make us hesitate to assume this obligation. This is no more an "entangling alliance" than is the four-power treaty of the Washington Conference.

The third obligation consists in an agreement to join the other members in a world-wide boycott, social and economic, against any Covenant breaking state. The dependence of every nation on others, for food, raw materials or markets, renders this the new substitute of the modern business world for war. No commercial nation can possibly withstand it. If Germany and Austria had known that if Belgium should be invaded, instantly all communication with other nations and markets, by rail, sea, post or telegraph, would be closed they never would have entered upon their desperate enterprise. The statesmen of all nations are a unit in believing that this general boycott will prove a powerful agency in preventing future wars.

The fourth obligation—Article Ten, providing that each League member undertakes to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every other member, has been asserted to require us becoming a party to every European war. It is enough to say of this that the Assembly of the League last September authoritatively construed it as meaning that the obligation of any member to go to the assistance of another is limited to nations on the same continent in which the occasion for the war shall arise. Thereby this terri-

fying article becomes not more onerous than the Monroe Doctrine of which we are so justly proud, for our obligation to go to war under it would be limited to North and South America. Moreover, any possibility that we should be involved in war under Article Ten without the consent of our Congress could be removed by a single sentence declaring that in joining the League we interpret this article as being subject to our constitutional limitation that only Congress can declare war. And not a nation in the League nor a person in this country would object to such a reservation.

When to all this we add that the first article of the covenant gives the express right to any member to withdraw from the League on two years' notice, we must regard as mere campaign extravagance the fears expressed two years ago that our entering the League would involve us in long wars with nations—every one of which would prefer our friendship to that of any other nation under the sun. . . . Fifty-two other nations, each as jealous of its sovereignty and liberty as we are of ours, have joined the League—why should America hesitate—why be afraid? The League is already proving itself to be a league for peace in many unexpected ways. It now includes all the important powers of the world except Germany, Russia and the United States; all naval power of the world other than ours, and four-fifths of the population of the globe. It has already brought to peaceful settlement four as promising prospects of war as its worst enemy could have wished to see provided to test its usefulness and power. Finland and Sweden were drifting inevitably into war over the Aaland Islands; armies of Poland and Lithuania were on the march to settle a boundary dispute; Germany and Poland were seemingly hopelessly divided over the partition of Upper Silesia and were actively preparing for war; and Jugoslavia had actually invaded Al-

bania, when the League in each case was called upon and, by applying the methods of the Covenant, effected settlements which insured lasting peace. In two years the League established a Permanent Court of International Arbitration which has been an American aspiration for half a century. It dealt with the epidemic of typhus in Russia in a manner beyond all praise, it rescued a half million soldiers from slow death in Russian prisons, and it has dealt with the deplorable traffic in women and girls so successfully that even our Government has recognized its good work to the extent of sending an "observer" to report upon it.

This is but part of the League's accomplishment but if it were all, it would have more than justified the hopes of mankind that are centered in it. The difficulty in the past has been, not that international problems have been insoluble but that there has not been any permanent international agency to attempt to solve them before it was too late.

The League was designed to deal with conditions after the World War was ended, but that war has never been ended by a ratified treaty of peace with Turkey. The League is not an agency to enforce the Versailles Treaty. Hence it made no effort to settle the war between Greece and Turkey or to prevent the invasion of the Ruhr by France.

The League is the last and only hope for escape from another world war—there is no other alternative. The religion of the Prince of Peace, after twenty centuries, fails to make an end of war, but no one thinks of condemning it on that account—rather we seek to aid and extend it. In the League, the United States in these, its fateful, formative years, can improve and strengthen it, but outside of it, our influence inevitably makes for the destruction of it. And the signs multiply that this enlightened nation of ours will not long tolerate the selfish timid policy of holding aloof from and of attempting to cripple the League—the supreme, and now the only, effort being made by the civilized nations of the world to solve the most fateful moral problem of all time.

The Reader's Digest

The Undying Redwood Tree

Condensed from The Review of Reviews (March)

Theodore M. Knappen

1. The amazing vitality of one of the oldest living things.
2. A fire-proof tree.
3. Its unusually rapid growth.
4. Phenomenal yields.
5. The most extensive perpetual lumbering project in the U. S.

REDWOOD wins. The big tree of the California coast, bearing the royal honors of American forests, has at last triumphed over fires, outpost farmers, lumbermen, and cattlemen. It has defied fires that would have twisted steel buildings into warped tangles, it has repelled the farmer and has driven out the cattle that were relied upon to turn the ancient forest land into pasture after the lumbermen had removed the crop of a thousand years' maturity. Now the lumbermen have decided that the big tree fought a righteous battle and a practical one. They have concluded that it is a tree par excellence for forestry management and permanent lumbering. And it is to be accorded the distinction of being the forest leader in America in the new era of continuous lumbering.

The tremendous grasp on vitality which keeps the tree sound at 1000 to 2000 years, and has made it one of the oldest living things on earth, has proved too much for man. Cut off at the base, its children sprout at the stump; dig out the stump and they spring up from the radiating roots. Chop down and burn off the sprouts and they come back, again and again; seven times of record has one piece of cut-over and burned-over redwood land been known to come back. Turn on the cattle to fatten on

the grass that comes up when the redwood comes down, and in five or six years the redwood sprouts, rising in loyal circles around the stumps of their fathers, kill out the grass and drive off the cattle.

Even fire does not bother the redwood very much. Owing to its lack of resin, the large amount of moisture, and the thickness of its bark, a large redwood is fire-proof. No forest fire is capable of even seriously injuring a mature redwood forest. So resistant is the tree to fire that it is or has been the common lumbering practice to burn over a timbered area after the trees have been felled so as to get rid of the tops and the undergrowth, in order that the task of getting the huge logs out may be facilitated. These clearing fires are made just as hot as possible, but they in no way affect the quantity or quality of the lumber obtained from the huge logs that come through them. No such fire is capable of destroying the vitality of the stumps and roots. A few months after lumbering, the green sprouts of future forest giants everywhere spring up. These sprouts follow fire after fire, but the fires undoubtedly exterminate many sprouts and impair the vigor of others. The problem of keeping fires from running through the brush growth in the dry season is a knotty one; but it is not permanent, as the crowns of the rapidly growing redwoods soon so shade this ground that the brush is killed off.

As forest areas go, the redwood region is limited. Just a little strip along the favoring foggy coast of California from San Francisco to Oregon—between the ocean and the mountain tops—and comprising only

1,360,000 acres. On 900,000 of these acres the forests as a whole are as they were when the pyramids were built and before. They contain a reserve of perhaps 60,000,000,000 feet of timber as against a present cutting of less than 600,000,000 feet a year, which reminds us that redwood has a margin of a century for reforestation to get full swing, and how little the lumbermen were moved by present-day exigencies in deciding to take up continuous lumbering methods.

The redwoods are marked for survival because of their tenacious virility, and the happy circumstance that they grow mostly on land that is not suitable for agriculture. Furthermore, though they reach the nearest approximation to immortality in all the teeming life of the world they also grow rapidly, possibly more rapidly in the first 50 or 100 years than any other coniferous tree. In a year they mount to a man's height; in 15 years they may top a 7-story building; in 40 to 50 years, standing in circles around the bones of a common ancestor, they may be as tall as a 15-story office building, three feet thick, and productive of as much as 50,000 to 125,000 feet of lumber to the acre.

The density of the heavy redwood forests is scarcely credible by those who have not seen them. Twilight always reigns beneath the trees. A stand of 5,000 board feet to the acre is considered very satisfactory for the smaller conifers, and 10,000 is exceptional; but the redwood forests will average around 50,000 feet to the acre on hundreds of thousands of acres. A tract in Humboldt county sealed an average of 84,000 feet for 96,443 acres. The redwoods are the tallest trees native to America, the maximum height being 350 feet, and the greatest diameter 25 feet. An ordinary tree of a diameter of five feet will yield lumber enough for a cottage. There is an authentic record of a single acre producing 1,431,530 feet of lumber, which is enough

to cover an acre of land with a solid wooden block 10 stories high. One 16-foot tree yielded 100,000 feet of lumber, and a 22-foot tree produced nearly 200,000 feet. Only such lumber content could make a trifling 2,000 square miles one of the notable timber regions of a country that still has hundreds of thousands of square miles of forest.

Last year six of the larger redwood companies engaged Major David T. Mason, a forestry engineer of Portland, to make a survey of the redwood country and advise them whether it would be good business to help the redwood "circles" in their stubborn fight for life—whether the companies would be justified in adopting a policy of permanent forest management. His report, after a year's investigation was favorable: a second crop will bring a reasonable return on the investment; existing investments in plant, organization, etc., will be protected; relations with the public with regard to good will, taxes, etc., will be improved; common carrier railways and harbors can be developed and operated in a way to render better service, because based on permanent rather than a temporary industry.

Practically all of the redwood lumbering companies are now either seriously considering a policy of continuous lumbering or have already adopted this policy. So the redwoods are certain to be saved commercially, and are to have the distinction of leading the way in the most extensive perpetual lumbering project so far undertaken in the United States. Great progress has also been made in preserving spacious areas of the stately primeval forest. Many individuals and lumber companies have presented to the State of California groves along the State highway through the redwood region; the State has appropriated \$300,000 for the purchase of such tracts, and an effort is being made to have the federal government purchase at least several thousand acres.

The Dawn Man

Condensed from McClure's Magazine (March)

Henry Fairfield Osborn and William King Gregory

SOMEWHERE in the recesses of remote antiquity the human race began. Just where or how is a matter largely of conjecture, theory, speculation. But man most certainly is not descended from any known monkey. Man has a long line of ancestry of his own, reaching perhaps two million years into the dim shadows of time. The growth of man through the ages was parallel to that of the family of apes and monkeys, but representing a stock absolutely separate and distinct. The theory of evolution assumes that human beings were not always human; that long ago, time periods running into millions of years, man's ancestors were creatures in a process of gradual development. Man's ancestors were undoubtedly ape-like creatures, but to assume that this means that man is descended from apes or monkeys is absurd. The common ancestors of *homo sapiens* (the man that can think and reason) and present-day apes and monkeys were mammals of the Primate stem. Ages ago, perhaps five million or more years ago, the Primates began, in the process of evolution, to split into groups, separate and distinct, which developed into the progenitors of man, the modern ape and monkey.

In remote antiquity the Primate stem grew gradually away from other orders of mammals. Various offshoots reached forth, tentative branches as it were. We know a few of the strange families of monkeys, extinct now for hundreds of thousands of years, that first resulted. These passed, while the main stem, still groping its way, gave forth the first of the anthropoid ("man-like") apes. Gradually yet another stock

diverged, a humanoid stock consisting of what aptly might be termed experimental or tentative man. The human race is a definite product of evolution, but for at least a million years it was distinct and apart from purely animal stock.

A similar example of evolution is the existing families of equines (horses, zebras, asses), tapirs, and rhinoceroses. It can be said positively that the horse is not descended from the rhinoceros or the tapir, or *vice versa*. Yet this group, now widely separated, represents surviving fragments of what was once a great natural order of hooved animals. For it is a known fact that as we go back into geologic time the differences between the various families of these hooved animals become less and less until we find the so-called horses, tapirs and rhinoceroses of today, so similar in appearance that expert paleontologists have difficulty in distinguishing one from the other. In other words, in remote ages, the diverging lines approach a common starting-point, and their resemblance is due to inheritance from a common ancestor. In the same way, the apes, and monkeys, traced back through the ages by means of fossilized remains, undoubtedly reach a common starting-point. The difficulty of proving this by unbroken chains of fossil evidence, as can be done with the hooved animals, lies in the difference of habits. The hooved animals lived on the plains. Our ancestors lived among the forests. Upon death the humic acid of the forest leaves hastened decay of man's ancestors, while the skeletons of the ancestors of the horse, tapir, and rhinoceros, living on the plains where

the preserving elements had better play, are comparatively abundant.

When we remember that an entire century of exploration in all parts of the globe for remains of prehistoric man has yielded us only five species, nearly or remotely related to modern man, the difficulty of locating fossils of scientific value will be understood. The finding of the remains of the "Dawn Man of Piltdown" in England was made in 1911. A portion of the jaw bone, several important parts of the skull, several teeth, and the remains of several flint instruments were found in a gravel pit. From these the scientist is able to say that the "Dawn Men" lived as long ago as 500,000 B. C. The oldest human race of which we now have a complete skeleton is the Neanderthal Man, which lived in Western Europe during the last glacial period, probably from 75,000 to 50,000 B. C. The probable ancestor of the Neanderthal Man is the so-called Heidelberg man, a fossil that may be anywhere from 250,000 to 500,000 years old. From this single bone we have constructed a replica of what may be fairly assumed to be the skull of the owner.

The immediate predecessors of modern man were the race known as Cro-Magnon, about 15,000 B. C. We have so complete a record of them that with their arrival we can begin to write the history of prehistoric man in more or less detail. This race brought in the beginnings of art and the first bone industry. Crude pictures of their handiwork can still be seen on the walls of caves in France. The Cro-Magnons, with a more active brain, superseded the Neanderthals. Then the Neolithic race, slightly higher in the scale of intellect supplanted the Cro-Magnons.

What is behind the mystery of man's rapid development? The ape has toiled along the path of evolution together with man; yet today the ape cannot speak, cannot form the simplest rude instrument. Man's remote ancestors could do these things. The answer is glands. Glands control

the growth and development of structure. We know the ductless glands manufacture secretions which, let into the blood, create changes in structure. The pituitary gland directly affects the size and shape of the brain-case. The action of the glands themselves is operated by some unfathomable forces that we cannot isolate. There probably is a complex series of interdependent causes for their action. Recent experiments tend to show that the different vitamines in foods produce different effects on the ductless glands, and thus indirectly upon the skull form, color of the skin, stature, etc. Indeed, F. P. Armitage, an English scientist claims to have recognized different food elements that make the Negro black, woolly-headed, and long-skulled; the Mongolian, yellow, smooth-skinned, and round-headed; the Latin swarthy, and the Nordic blond. If this is true, and man can master the glands and force them to do his bidding through improved food habits, what will be the course of evolution, aided by man? A hint is perceived in the stages of development of the highest and lowest forms of humanity today. The effects are apparent—the causes are gradually being brought to light—the control of the future is the great aim.

Where man is bound depends entirely on what means are adopted against the unchecked multiplication of the less fit. Evolution is going on today, just as it has since the beginning of time, a fact evidenced in the wide difference between the degrees of development in the extremes of existing humanity. The fate of such inferior peoples as the aborigines of Australia is sealed. The law of the survival of the fittest still operates. We can speculate on the future bounds of the intellect of man only on the evidence of the past. The evolution of no other animal has kept pace with that of man. There is positive evidence that the evolution of apes today is away from rather than toward man.

The Reader's Digest

Politics: Behind the Scenes—1

Condensed from *Collier's, The National Weekly* (Feb. 24)

Byron R. Newton

"Why can't a public officeholder be as honest and decent serving the State as he is in his dealings with his neighbors?" Byron R. Newton has found that a government employee who plays the game square is usually a political and financial bankrupt when he leaves office. 'To be honest and decent with the Government and the public,' he says, 'is a constant warfare. It has been a thankless fight, and most men who undertook it either abandoned the struggle or were thrust out to make room for those who would play the game.' There are honest and able men in public life. There must be more. There will be when we make conditions decent for them."

IT is easy to refuse a stranger seeking some improper thing, but it is hard to deny a political friend asking the same improper thing in the name of friendship. A friend came to me one day in the Cosmos Club in Washington just before I became Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. He had held high place in the Roosevelt Administration and is today a prominent citizen of New York. A few years in a small-salaried position in Washington had somehow brought him considerable wealth and he was a large stockholder in one of the powerful public utility corporations of the District of Columbia. Calling me into a quiet corner, he told of a certain law that had passed Congress some years before, authorizing the construction of a Federal heating, lighting, and power plant in the city

of Washington. "You may be urged to revive that," he said, "but don't do it. It will only make you trouble. If the matter comes to you, just forget it and we won't forget you."

Not being much of a politician, I looked into it with more than ordinary interest and found a feasible plan, worked out carefully by a group of non-political experts and engineers, for the establishment by the Government of a central heating plant in Washington. It meant an enormous saving to the Government and to the citizens of Washington in supplying light, heat, and power to government buildings and to other consumers. But the law authorizing it had been soothed into slumber from year to year by the soft words of just such influential men as the one I met in the Cosmos Club. The local power and lighting company, and back of it the big electric interests, did not want at Washington, in Uncle Sam's front yard, any demonstration of how cheaply electric service might be produced there. There were three chief reasons for building the plant. First, to lower the cost of local electricity; second, to remove from Washington a score of smoke nuisances then and still created by separate plants in government buildings; and, third, to build a hydro-electric plant and secure adequate water supply for Washington by development of the falls of the Potomac River, a few miles above the city. These points were so well understood locally that no attempt was made to question the economy or practicability of the project; the enemy got around it another way. Our plans provided for the erection of this central power plant, on Government land, on the banks of the Potomac River where fuel could

the entire force, and the matter had become a scandal not only in New York, but in the ports of Europe as well. It was not a pleasant task, but it was a duty, and this investigation proved to be my crowning crime in the eyes of the political system that seeks to defile and strangle any attempt at honest administration of public office. The investigation proceeded to a point where we had indicted a half dozen inspectors, had dismissed a larger number. One of the worst offenders chanced to be the friend and lieutenant of a powerful politician in Brooklyn. He was about to go to trial. Strong appeals were made to me by his political friends. Then the appeal came from Washington. Later, an official letter came from Washington directing me to reinstate this man after a period of suspension. I refused to obey that order. A few days later another official letter from Washington asked for my immediate resignation, six

months prior to the expiration of my four-year term. My resignation went in, and the person under indictment was then restored to his former place.

Such incidents are common to the man who travels the dusty road of public service. To be honest and decent with the Government and the public is a constant warfare. It has been a thankless fight, and most men who undertook it either abandoned the struggle or were thrust out to make room for those who would play the game. But the light is breaking in. Our great American community is getting a clearer understanding of these things, and our people are beginning to think how something better may be established. We are nearing the period when it will be possible for a man to hold public office and be as honest and decent in the performance of his duties as he is in his business relations with his neighbors.

POLITICS BEHIND THE SCENES—1

(Continued from page 24)

officeholder who goes into the battle of civil life has no such reward. This is the greatest weakness of American politics today. In our political campaigns, the strategist of compromise is more likely to win. He wears the medals and gets the promotion. In war a man is rewarded for defending his government. In politics he is more often rewarded for not defending it.

The American people, the great mass of men and women who vote, want to be honest with their government because they feel it wants to be honest with them and would be so if politicians would permit. Years ago men went to political meetings and cheered madly just because they were Republicans or Democrats. Today they cheer less but think more. They care less about party and about politicians, but a great deal more about the real business of their government. They have lost something

in faith and emotion, but have gained vastly in knowledge, and politicians are beginning to appreciate that fact. So let us rejoice; there are interesting developments ahead. Political changes are now making toward more intelligent and more equitable government.

The old type of greedy, hypocritical leader, who never really led, is going and the field is opening to the men of the new program. So long as veterans of the old game remain in command of the ranks, the fight will be a hard one, but the new men will triumph just as surely as human intelligence and ideals endure. More speedily, perhaps, than we appreciate, this political revolution is approaching, and much nearer than we can imagine is the day when the best men in America may seek public office with confidence that intelligent, impartial administration will bring its just reward.

The Reader's Digest

Adventures in Arabia

Condensed from *The World's Work* (March)

E. Alexander Powell

This condensation supplements "Across the Burning Sands," by Mr. Powell, in the January Digest.

IT is a curious circumstance that of Arabia, whose shores are skirted daily by tourist-laden steamers, the Western world has less knowledge than of the Polar regions. Though in area the peninsula is one-third the size of the United States, the Europeans who have penetrated its interior can be numbered on one's fingers. It is the only land which has halted the onswEEP of civilization, the lives and customs of its ten million inhabitants having remained virtually unchanged since the world was young. It is the sole remaining country on the map considerable areas of which are marked "unexplored." It is the Last Frontier.

More untruths, more nonsense, have been written about the Arabs than about any race on earth. Our mental pictures have been formed from glimpses of "town Arabs" in the bazaars of coast towns, from sensational novels written superficially in the safety of Damascus hotels, and from ridiculous characterizations on the motion-picture screen. We picture the Arab as armed with a lance and a long-barrelled flintlock, whereas he is amply supplied with modern rifles and machine guns. We think of the Arabs as being wholly negligible from a political or military standpoint, when, as a matter of fact, they today hold the balance of power in western Asia and form the most potentially powerful element in the world of Islam.

Though the first European went to Arabia 700 B. C., in 26 centuries the white man has gotten less than a dozen miles inland. The Arab has not needed forts, or a fleet, to stop

the white man. The brown man draws over his head a thin fold of cotton; the white man covers his head with an inch of cork and the sun strikes through it and kills him. What threat could be offered by a European army to a people who are habituated to a climate where the mercury frequently rises to 130 (and no shade!) and has been known to drop 70 degrees in 30 minutes.

From time immemorial Arabia has been one of the world's great cross-roads. The shortest route between West and East, yet still traversed only by plodding caravans. The British, however, are making plans for a railway and pipe-line from Bagdad straight across the desert.

The term Bedouin distinguishes the nomadic Arabs from the "town Arabs" and the semi-sedentary Arabs engaged in agriculture. There are many tribes of these Bedouins who migrate according to the seasons of the year from one region to another, from their winter to their summer camping grounds. They range over distances equivalent to that from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border, accompanied by their womenfolk and children, their camels, horses and sheep. The trek of one of the largest tribes affords an imposing spectacle — a nation on the move. I encountered one of the two largest tribes on their migration, and the goat's-hair tents of the main encampment stretched along the skyline for upwards of seven miles. Far as the eye could see the plain was dotted with grazing animals. The local French authorities estimated that this single tribe had with it 30,000 sheep and 50,000 camels and that its sheikh could put in the field 20,000 well-armed fighting men. The sheikhs of

the stress will not be placed on differences, but that full opportunity will be given for frank discussion between representative Fundamentalists and Evangelicals of the vital beliefs and aims and tasks which they all share together as the followers of a common Lord and Master. Both must squarely face three facts. First, that the author of their faith placed the entire stress not on declarations, but on demonstrations, on life and deeds, not on creeds. Second, that the youth of today must live in the twentieth century and that their faith and their development should be the first concern of the church. Third, Protestantism is today confronted by stupendous tasks and responsibilities which can only be met with united front and in the spirit of Him who found his life by losing it. His many-sided teachings contain the fundamentals on which all his followers can safely and securely take their stand, content to differ regarding the debatable questions of intellectual belief.

2. Protestantism is undergoing a silent but fundamental transformation in its church life. This change is revealed, not in the majority of churches, but in those under riper, more progressive leadership. The constantly dwindling Sunday morning and evening audiences, and the conspicuous absence of youth, indicate that in a majority of the Protestant churches, where everything else is made secondary to the sermon, all is not well. Doctor Francis E. Clark, in a significant article in the October, 1922, "Yale Review" on "The Menace of the Sermon," has courageously diagnosed this twentieth-century peril in Protestantism. He points out that too often the pastor is called to a church not because of his ability as a practical spiritual leader but because of his reputation as a preacher; that the tragedy of many a pastor's life is the obligation and his own inability to produce each year fifty or a hundred memorable sermons; and that this sermonolatry develops sermon-tasters rather than active, efficient Christians.

This emphasis on the sermon is another of Protestantism's prophetic inheritances. In the days of John Knox or the Wesleys or George Fox or Alexander Campbell, the people were conscious of listening to the voice of a prophet. Through the contemporary prophet God spoke again, as he did through an Isaiah or a John the Baptist. Our early American forefathers lived largely in the atmosphere of the Old Testament, and the men of God who preached to them frankly assumed the manner and role of the old Hebrew prophets. From time to time in later years men like Beecher and Phillips Brooks, with a conspicuous prophetic gift, have inspired with divine truth and love intently listening thousands.

This high appreciation of the living prophet is one of the glories of Protestantism; but when the church expects every preacher to be a prophet forty or fifty Sundays a year, it is building on a false assumption and is in danger of tragic awakening. To many churches awakening is now coming, and the problem of readjustment to facts is insistent.

3. Moreover, it is well to remember that Paul, in his burning letter to the Corinthian Christians, urges each to serve the beloved community according to his special ability. Not for a moment does he assume that prophecy or preaching is the only gift essential to the spiritual life of the church. May it not be that this assumption has misled Protestantism? It may be the devoted mother or the enthusiastic settlement worker or the invalid saint or the faithful physician or youth with glowing vision or old men dreaming dreams, who have a message that will set cold hearts afame and send young and old alike out into paths of joyous service. The modern community church is seeking ways in which these messages may find normal and effective expression.

Protestantism is also awakening to the need of a differentiated ministry. It is no new discovery. In the little Christian community that Paul established

(Continued on page 34)

The Menace of the Polish Jew

Condensed from *The World's Work* (Feb.)

Burton J. Hendrick

(Continued from *February Digest*)

THE Eastern Jews in this country have merely duplicated the kind of merchandising which for centuries they have followed in Europe. The lines of business that demanded large capital, organization, and manufacturing on a big scale they ignored; we find them filtering into those branches where the opportunities for small beginnings and individual operations are more favorable. The great American Tobacco Company, for example, is entirely "American." But the middlemen with whom it has constantly to deal are, for the most part, Jews. The Jew has demonstrated so much skill in buying the leaf tobacco from the farmers that he controls practically 90 per cent of the crop. As a tobacco manufacturer the Jew figures hardly at all in the production of cigarettes, plug tobacco, or snuff, which are highly organized industries requiring large capital, factories, machinery. The Jew does not take to organization; he is not gifted at the operation of machinery; he eschews the industries that demand a great initial outlay; and so in tobacco, as in all things, he is the shoe-string merchant.

Cigar making is still largely a manual industry; all that the industrious Jew needs are a few handfuls of leaf tobacco, a board, and a knife; with these he can make his beginnings as a manufacturer. The first factory is a tenement room; the first employees are the wife and children of the aspiring industrialist, and in a few days the head of the family starts peddling cigars. In a few years the one-time peddler has established a profitable business, having rented a room and pressed Jewish immigrants into the service.

But capitalism on a small and individual scale could hardly support the great mobs of Eastern Jews which immigrated here between 1881 and 1914. The great American business of ready-made clothing seems to have been created especially with Jewish immigration in mind. The manufacture and the sale of wearing apparel had for ages exercised a fascination for the Jew. A common sight in the cities of Poland was the hundreds of Jews and Jewesses sitting in the ghetto plying their needles and their shears. In this country they were readily absorbed by the sweatshop. The several members of the family could work their own hours, with time for the prayers, ablutions, and other devotional observances which are indispensable in the daily life of the orthodox Hebrew. But a deeper explanation is once more the familiar story of Jewish individualism and talent for small-scale capitalism. It is one of the few remaining American industries in which a man can start manufacturing on a small scale and gradually build up a big business, and it is one of the few that is not yet combined in large corporations or trusts. There are still several thousand independent clothing factories in greater New York. Every cap-maker, sponger, sewing-machine operator, and cutter is the proprietor of tomorrow.

The story of Jewish monopoly in the clothing trades is a story of cruel exploitation of Jews by Jews. The masses who entered the business were not tailors in any real sense. The work was minutely divided and short instruction sufficed to teach a newly arrived immigrant one of the many operations necessary to the comple-

tion of a garment. Formerly the manufacturers had really made the product in all its details; now the work was farmed out to a multitude of contractors. One would do the cutting, one make the coat, another the vest, another the "pants" and so on. A contractor would recruit ten to twelve operatives from the recently arrived immigrant ship. These would congregate in his tenement house, bent and wretched figures, huddled in a small unventilated room, for 10, 12, 16, sometimes 18 hours a day, the atmosphere fetid with the odors of cooking and heated with the fire of pressing irons, every man feverishly struggling to complete his operation on a garment before another garment was passed to him — hardly anything more horrible than such a physical and nervous strain could be imagined. The contractor depended entirely for funds upon the manufacturer for whom he worked; the latter would call each Monday, receive the garments and pay cash. Conditions, of course, have vastly improved since the early days; the work is now done for the most part in factories; but the essentials of the organization, the contract system, are still maintained.

The Eastern Jews have used the cash heaped up in the cloak and suit trade for operations in other lines. That the Russian Jews dominate the "movies" just as overwhelmingly as they dominate the clothing trades is the fact, and the still more interesting fact is that there is the closest connection between the two occupations. The entertainment of the American masses is provided almost exclusively by men who a few years ago were occupied in clothing them. William Fox was a sponger in a garment factory; Marcus Loew and Adolph Zukor were fur dealers and Carl Laemmle started his career in the clothing business. Writers who are called to Hollywood are somewhat discouraged to find that the men with whom they must discuss their scenarios are almost exclusively ex-buttonhole.

makers, basters, and pressers, whose knowledge of the English language is very limited and whose artistic taste has not progressed greatly beyond the intellectual standards of Laura Jean Libbey. There is much discussion today as to what is the matter with moving pictures; but what is the matter with moving pictures is very apparent; the trouble lies in the fact that they are merely one department of the cloak and suit industry.

The other activity in which the Russian Jew has extensively specialized is real estate. He comes from a part of the world where the ownership of land has immemorially been the privilege of the aristocracy; more than this, the laws of Russia have always excluded Jews from possession of the soil. The Jew worms his way into the ownership of the soil in precisely the same way that he starts in the clothing business, in cigar making, in the liquor trade. He scrapes together a few hundred dollars with which he purchases an equity in a tenement house, giving mortgages for the remainder. He then moves his family into the least desirable apartment; he himself becomes the janitor; his wife does not disdain the job of the scrubwoman; his sons not infrequently do service as painters, paper hangers, and repairmen. The family spends the minimum for living expenses, clothes, and amusement, with but one purpose in view — to meet those payments! No "agent" is employed; every week the proprietor collects the rents. He thus purchases a \$30,000 or \$40,000 tenement with a "shoe-string." One house paid for, he buys another; he begins speculating, buying one day and selling another. So skilful are these Jews in this game that practically all their racial competitors long since retired from the field. A list of the owners of New York reads like an immigrant manifest at Ellis Island: if you glance over the real estate transfers in the morning paper, it is seldom that any except a

Jewish name strikes your eye. Yet the same disparity which the Jews show in other directions, commercial, scientific, and artistic, appears also in this. Able as they are in many ways they seldom reach the top. The greatest landowner of New York are still Christians. The Jews own little property on Broadway, Wall Street, Fifth Avenue, and other especially high-grade areas. The great skyline that greets the incoming passenger represents Gentile not Jewish enterprise. New York, in its finest architectural aspects, is still the preserve of native stock and every day becomes more so.

Of course the one business that most people have in mind when they think of Jewish activities is the theatre. The word "business" is used with complete accuracy. The Jews commonly use the expression "the amusement business." The words tell the whole story. Yet, in estimating their influence upon the stage, it is necessary to be discriminating. The actors and actresses for the larger part, are Gentiles; the same is true of the playwrights, and, to a greater extent than is commonly supposed, of the managers who put on the plays. The artistic side of the stage with certain important exceptions, is thus in the hands of Christians. However, the fact remains that the Jewish influence on the stage has been deplorable. Only to a limited extent are they theatrical men at all; primarily they are nothing but dealers in theatrical real estate. By purchase, lease, or other arrangement they have succeeded in gaining control over most of the theatres in the United States. Their business is that of renting these buildings to the actual producers of plays. This power makes them practically the dictators of the theatrical profession; they can say what plays are to be produced, and where, and when. The Jewish theatrical syndicate reduced theatre managers to the position of caretakers; they had nothing to say as to the companies they

would engage; all this was arranged for them by a "booking office" in New York. The result is the elimination of the managers of the old days who gave distinction to the American stage. They trained their own companies, controlled their bookings. Every important American city had its own stock company, furnishing not only the wholesome amusement but doing great service as schools of actors and actresses. In those days such actors as Edwin Booth and Mary Anderson could start on a tour with no company of their own, using the stock companies in the cities they "played" as "support." The most unfortunate effect of Jewish control was this disappearance of these old schools of acting. Actors like Edwin Booth, Joseph Jefferson, Richard Mansfield, Lawrence Barret, and actresses like Mary Anderson, Ada Rehan and Helena Modeska have vanished, leaving no successors.

There are many other aspects of Russian Jewish immigration. The second generation is largely employed in the public service—as clerks and stenographers in the city departments, as lawyers, doctors, dentists, as school teachers, policemen, and firemen. Yet this survey of their activities, limited as it is, proves one thing. Their "assimilation" has taken place to a very moderate extent. They have penetrated only slightly into the multitudinous businesses and industries that make up that great complex known as American life. Any race fifty per cent of whose people live in one city, and the remaining fifty per cent in other large American cities, can hardly be regarded as having become flesh of the flesh of the American body. Perhaps, in the course of a century or so, a wider distribution and a wider range of energies may be accomplished, but the task of incorporating these 3,000,000 and more already here will monopolize the Nation's digestive powers for a long time to come. Until that result has been attained it would be folly to add still more to our responsibilities of this kind. The Nation has all the town dwellers that are good for it; one of the great tasks of the present is to get people from the city into the country. The three-per cent restriction on immigration therefore represents statesmanlike wisdom of the highest kind, and all attempts to break this down should be vigorously resisted.

RECENT TRENDS OF PROTESTANTISM

(Continued from page 30)

lished at Corinth there were prophets, apostles, teachers and healers. The vanguard of the army of trained religious leaders has already entered the service. Directors of the social and recreational life of the church are in training. In certain individual churches gifted leaders of the musical activities in the church and community have demonstrated how indispensable are their services. With this working staff, the pastor is able to become a shepherd of souls and to organize and direct the spiritual life and work of the church as a whole. When practical Christian unity makes it possible for each local church to become a community church and to minister alike to ignorant and learned, rich and poor, saints and sinners, the prophetic function of Protestantism will begin to be fully realized.

The stress that is being laid on the teaching ministry of the church marks another unmistakable trend in progressive Protestantism. It is in accord with the method of the Founder of Christianity, for he was not primarily a preacher but a teacher. The so-called "Sermon on the Mount" is not in the form of a sermon but is in reality an informal talk on the hillside. Christianity from the first was a teaching religion. In the Corinthian church teachers were regarded as important as the prophets or apostles. Throughout Protestantism the vicious theory that youth must first be allowed to go wrong in order later to experience a catastrophic conversion is fast being abandoned. At last the words of the ancient Jewish sage are being fully accepted:

"Train up a child in the way he should go;

And when he is old he will not depart from it."

4. Underlying the religious-educa-

tion movement that is rapidly transforming the life and the architecture of many Protestant churches are the accepted principles of modern psychology and education. The rediscovered Bible, interpreted into the terms of modern life, is its chief textbook. This movement is fast putting the youth and the leaders of Protestantism into intelligent touch with the vital principles revealed in the past experience of the race and with the active forces in our present civilization. In this direct way it is equipping them for the work of moral and religious reconstruction that must be done by the prophetic forces in Christendom.

5. The "sects" undoubtedly have their serious problems. They are still a dissonant babel of voices and have found as yet no common basis for united action; but they are seeking it. In the language of yesterday, many of them need the experience of sound conversion that will lead them to forget their bickering, their man-made creeds, their petty rivalries, their pathetic trust in mere organization, and inspire them to try the bold experiment of finding their life by losing it in the service of mankind. Too often they have followed wrong impulses or clung too tenaciously to institutions long outgrown; but they are usually ready to learn from their mistakes. They are still responsive to the voice of the real prophet and, therefore, ever open to new truth. They are, as a rule, in close touch with the world's thought and life. They are eager to satisfy men's deepest religious needs. There are unmistakable indications that they are passing through a great transitional period out of which will emerge a more unified, a more spiritual, and a more truly prophetic Protestantism.

The Reader's Digest

"The Eighth Wonder of the World"

Condensed from The National Geographic Magazine (Feb.)

Adam Warwick

"The mightiest barrier ever built has stood guard over the land of Chin for twenty centuries."

ACCORDING to astronomers, the only work of man's hands which would be visible to the human eye from the moon is the Great Wall of China. Its size may be imagined from the calculation that if the materials of which it was built were used to encircle the globe at the Equator, they would be sufficient to form a barrier eight feet high and three feet thick. In 1790 it was estimated that there were more brick and stone in the Great Wall than in all the buildings in the United Kingdom.

Historians class this mighty rampart as the "Eighth Wonder of the World"; and not the least wonderful part about it is that it has survived all the others save one, the Great Pyramid at Gizeh. The Great Wall of China differed from the other famous works of antiquity in that it served a utilitarian purpose as a barrier to keep the barbarians of the north from overrunning China, whose fertile plains invited them. The idea was not ridiculous, in an era when bows and arrows and twisted pikes were the weapons of the invaders.

Walls dividing rival feudal kingdoms or protecting them from foreign enemies are mentioned in the Chinese chronicles as early as the 5th century B. C., and it is probable that portions of these walls were utilized by the emperor Chin Shih Huang Ti, who extended and linked them together when he built his "Long Rampart." Begun in 219 B. C., the

Barrier was completed in 204 B. C. To this mighty emperor alone is due the conception of a work probably unequaled in any land or by any people for the amount of human labor bestowed upon it. Three hundred thousand troops, besides prisoners of war and all criminals in the land, including many dishonest officials, were impressed for the work. How these unskilled laborers accomplished their task with the primitive means at their disposal, how they overcame the physical difficulties imposed on them by the steep slopes of the high mountain ranges, remains a marvel to this day. Moreover, the problem of getting food to them can be judged from the statement that, "of 182 loads of grain dispatched, only one would reach its destination, the rest being eaten or sold along the road." A weaker man might well have hesitated to plan an undertaking which, though popular in the main as a defensive measure, entailed great suffering on the people. But Chin Shih Huang Ti was one of the strongest and most remarkable characters in Chinese history or, indeed, in any history—a powerful figure, who left behind him an example of personal activity unequaled among Oriental sovereigns. Furthermore, he united China by subjugating a group of warring states from 246 to 210 B. C. Unfortunately, Chinese classical historians, "prone to describe the deeds of their great men with uncompromising finality as good or bad," have declared anathema the name of this great molder of an empire because he burned the Classics and buried 500 scholars alive when the latter dared criticize him for proclaiming himself the "Only First" (First Emperor), thus sweeping away the past. Yet

to his genius in choosing able lieutenants was due the first standing army in China, an army of several hundred thousand men, which he raised, equipped, and maintained in a peace-loving country to defend his Great Wall.

Despite the time and labor expended upon it, Chin Shih Huang Ti's mud barrier soon crumbled away. But during the reign of the Mings (1368 to 1644 A. D.) it was again necessary to defend their empire against the Northern Barbarians, whom they had expelled but were never able to conquer in their native haunts. The restorations of this period were solid and even elegant, long stretches of the Great Wall being encased in brick or strengthened with blocks of stone. Throughout the eastern section the Wall was made 25 feet thick at the base, 15 at the top, and varied from 15 to 30 feet in height. The top was protected by bricks and defended by a slight parapet. There were more than 20,000 towers, which were practically a chain of small fortresses, and over 10,000 signal beacons. As the Chinese had long known the use of gunpowder, they employed rude cannon to assist the troops in the defense of the Wall. Some of these primitive weapons were actually mounted on tripods and placed on the tops of dominating peaks.

Almost every reign saw new defense works erected. Today, despite its decay, the Great Wall remains a magnificent monument, which leaves a powerful impression on even the most frivolous minds. Once seen, it can never be forgotten. But imagination fails to grasp this remarkable structure as a whole, for the Wall is about 1,250 miles long in a straight line, while its turnings and windings increase it to almost 2,000 miles. This means that it would stretch from Philadelphia to beyond Topeka, Kansas.

No description can convey an ade-

quate idea of the immensity or grandeur of the Great Wall of China, as it writhes along the mountain peaks, giving an impression of infinite power and at the same time of infinite calm and peace. The more we gaze upon it the more we wonder and admire, and even a thousand miles of travel in its mighty shadow seems insufficient to enable us to grasp the proportions of this enormous barrier, which continues its uninterrupted way for hundreds of leagues toward the wilderness.

In the important mountain passes, big guard posts of a hundred men or more were stationed in many of the towers of the Wall, which were equipped with fuel, food, medicines, and weapons to withstand a siege of several months. Treasures of antiquae cannon and small arms were discovered not long ago in one of these bastions. It seems unlikely that permanent garrisons were stationed in the most inaccessible regions, especially since we know that an elaborate system of beacon fires was perfected to bring reinforcements against any threatened point.

As a practical measure of protection, the Great Wall was never really effective. China was overwhelmed again and again, in spite of it, by the huge racial movements of the Tartar hordes, which for 2,000 years devastated Asia and even troubled Europe from time to time; but it did prove valuable as a rampart against petty raids, and its moral effect on any but the greatest conquerors must have been tremendous.

Nowadays the idea of the Great Wall as a defensive fortification is entirely abandoned. But the simple people believe that the Long Rampart, stretched along the frontiers like a huge fossil dragon, protects China from evil influences. Gradually crumbling to pieces, yet majestic in its ruin, the Monster, alas, seems to be losing his power to do even this.

The Reader's Digest

Duping Financial Babes

Condensed from *The World's Work* (March)

Schuyler Patterson

"If the public becomes familiar with the methods used in the underworld of finance it will be better able to withstand the appeals of unscrupulous houses."

Editors of *The World's Work*.

THE arrest of three men in New York, directing geniuses of the Crager System of "Reloaders," who had amassed more than a million dollars within a few months, has brought to light a few entirely new methods of separating the public from its money.

During the boom years of 1919 and 1920 practically any industry could show progress, whether efficiently handled or not. But when the crash came many of them faced bankruptcy and needed more capital to bridge over the existing dearth of business to better times in prospect. Bankers wisely refused to advance money in quantities, so officers of such concerns have been and are ready to snatch at straws. At this point a "reloading" house offers its services in raising the welcome additional capital. But when the time comes for bickering the reloader house does not know whether it wishes to serve the Jones Company, for example. How many stockholders have they? Only five hundred. That is very few. It is hardly worth while, but if the Jones Co. is willing to pay Crager from 60 to 75 percent of the money which it raises, from stockholders of the Jones Co., the matter will receive consideration. The Jones Co. is desperate. So the agreement is made, and the names of Jones Co. stockholders are turned over to Crager.

Stockholders of the Jones Co. soon begin to receive letters from brokerage houses in Chicago, Boston, and Baltimore, operated by Crager under various assumed names. These houses purport to be interested in the immediate purchase of 500 shares of Jones Co. stock for which they will pay \$8 a share, subject of course to prior purchase and change in price. They request an immediate reply. Recipients of these missives are deeply stirred. Stock which they thought worthless and which originally cost but \$5 a share is now being bid for right and left at \$8. Certainly a rare opportunity. One and all answer, regretting that they have not 500 shares but offering holdings of 200 or 300 shares. They receive immediate replies that the bid is for 500 shares only, no smaller amounts desired, but the brokerage houses will leave the bid open for a few days, subject, etc., in the event that the holder can obtain more. Meanwhile an excited letter comes from the Crager Co. as Fiscal Agents for the Jones Co. Mr. Client must not allow himself to be duped by certain brokerage concerns which are endeavoring to buy the shares of the company for a song. Large interests in Wall Street seek control of the Jones Co. If Mr. Client allows himself to be fooled he will lose all possible chance of the big profits which are now but in the offing. Wait for further word from the Crager Co. Mr. Client is then visited by two important-looking gentlemen—"Special Representatives" of the Crager Co., the Fiscal Agents. Anxiously they inquire whether Mr. Client has sold his stock. The Jones Co. has come into its own. Its patient has at length received due recognition, and large interests are trying

to gain control of the company through stock ownership. Eight dollars a share is laughable for the Jones Co. stock now. With present prospects, dividends of that amount will be paid every month and the stock worth \$100 a share within no time. Jones and his associates, honest men that they are, have ordered that no one be allowed to take advantage of those who entrusted them with their funds when things looked darkest. Jones has insisted to the Board of Directors that, instead of buying up the stock themselves, the stockholders be forewarned and the shares in the treasury which the scheming Wall Street financiers might obtain be distributed to stockholders pro rata at the original subscription price, that they solely may reap the huge benefits. Mr. Client is invited to read carefully a beautifully embossed certificate, allotting to him 300 shares of treasury stock at \$5 a share to which he is entitled to subscribe. His callers make it very clear that his action either way is of no importance to them. At the same time they are legally responsible (that is why two of them are sent) for his proper understanding of the case. These two men have travelled a great distance to see him; they must return at once. What he does is of no moment to them, but he must make up his mind without temporizing. Mr. Client has every confidence in the gentlemen not only because of their impressive personalities, but as a result of the "build up" effected by the various letters and telegrams he has received. It is a matter of record that in about 90 percent of instances Mr. Client buys.

"Electing" is another almost invariably successful plan. In this case Mr. Client is addressed on the stationery of the Advisory Board of the Jones Co., the letter signed by Mr. Jones, Chairman. He is advised that a representative will call with a matter of moment to both the Jones Co. and to Mr. Client. The visitor arrives and tells Mr. Client that he has been sent to him pursuant to the pol-

icy of the Jones Co., which is to select from its stockholders certain persons of outstanding acumen to serve on the Advisory Board and Mr. Client's name has been among those suggested. Before proceeding further, however, is Mr. Client prepared to make the journey to New York once every six weeks, if necessary, to attend meetings of the Board? Of course all expenses will be paid by the company, but occasionally a man may be too much involved in his own affairs to care to take that much time. Far from discouraging Mr. Client, the suggestion intrigues him. A trip to New York every six weeks to sit on an Advisory Board. At last he is receiving deserved recognition. Very well then. Before admitting Mr. Client to so important a position Mr. Robinson has a questionnaire and must ask that Mr. Client answer the questions as exactly as possible. All have an important bearing on the matter. Mr. Robinson produces a beautifully embossed sheet, bearing the name of the Advisory Board, etc., and Mr. Client proceeds to give his age, family data, etc., average bank balance, savings account, if any, bonds or securities owned, and finally, "Do you know of any reason why you should not be elected to the Advisory Board?"

Having made satisfactory answers, Mr. Client is assured by the salesmen that there is no reason why he should not now be elected. Either then or later the salesmen make it apparent to Mr. Client that, occupying his present prominent position in the Company, it will be necessary for him to have a larger interest in its affairs and it is therefore incumbent that he take an additional block of stock, the size of the block being predicated on the statement which the salesman has of Mr. Client's cash position. Mr. Client cannot plead lack of funds, and, with the free trips to the City in his mind's eye, he buys. His money goes the way of all money handed over to these gentry, and the salesman and his principal each gets more than the Jones Co.

The Background of India's Millions

Condensed from Asia, The American Magazine on the Orient (March)

Gertrude Emerson

An interpretation of the essential quality of the Indian background.

I CAUGHT Indian glimpses, now and then, of something that had its origin in a world of thought essentially different from mine. One day, for instance, I saw an old woman prostrating herself ecstatically in the road in front of a cow, afterwards seizing its tail and touching it to her forehead, by way of worship. I remember a man slowly pulling up a load of bricks to the top of a new building and singing a song as he worked, in which he asked God not to let the rope break. Early in the morning, I saw both men and women, with their garments on, bathing in the river for purposes of religious purification. On the bank was a sacred tulsi-plant, which each person watered with a few drops from his finger-tips. Presently all the people filled little brass jars with water from the river—for this was one of the mouths of the sacred Ganges—and, forming into a compact band, marched off together singing a chant to the God of their sect, whose V-shaped symbol was painted in lines of red and white on their foreheads. Again, I watched a Mohommadan saying his evening prayers, with curious dignity, in the midst of a noisy crowd waiting for a ferry-boat. He stood, as required, with his hands folded on his stomach; then bowed, and knelt, with his hands placed flat on the ground and his forehead pressed to earth. Three times he went through the ceremonies of his prayer; then,

with the others, he scrambled aboard the boat.

But most vividly I remember the great annual religious festival of Bengal. For ten days business was at a standstill. Here I saw for the first time "holy men," naked except for a loin-cloth, their bodies and faces smeared with ashes, their hair dyed a rusty red. They were lying on beds of spikes under umbrellas, but I noticed the spikes appeared quite blunt. Cheap prints of the goddess Kali, made in Germany, were everywhere offered for sale. A Hindu was leading about a cow, with a fifth leg growing out of her back, which he permitted the superstitious to touch in order to receive some ill-defined blessing in return for a certain number of coins. Down the middle of one of the narrow turnings sat a double row of maimed, deformed and horrible creatures, degenerates, who, in the name of religion, practised beggary. All along the way were scattered monstrous images of the gods. Sometimes worship was paid with a little incense, sometimes with flowers, sometimes with water, but almost always a Brahman priest, another and more sinister type of beggar, was intrenched near the scene, to separate the superstitious from such few coins as they had left.

The temple of Kali itself proved frightful beyond words. The courtyard was swarming with half-naked humanity whose bodies glistened with oil and perspiration. At one side goats were being slaughtered, as many as a thousand a day, I was told. Those making the offering received a wet, red mark on their foreheads. At the other side of the temple, the image of Kali was being

displayed. The expression on the faces of the crowds surging up the steps is something I shall never forget. It was a sight of Indian hysteria, of the religious madness which lies ready to wake at almost any provocation in the masses of the Hindu people.

Without the past, what is India's present? More and more, as one tries to understand India the conviction grows that nothing in India is without an explanation to be found in tradition rooted in dead centuries. And this tradition is an embodiment of an essentially religious attitude toward life. India's fundamental unity lies in an unbroken recognition of a spiritual order in the universe; in the aspiration manifest in all Indian thought toward an identification of the self with spiritual forces and an obedience to a system of moral law. At the bathing places of Benares, I saw countless multitudes of Hindus gathered to be healed of sickness, to be cleansed of sin and defilement, to die, that in their last immersion in the sacred river, they might come forth in purity, as they believed, and enter straight into heaven. I was poled up and down the Ganges. I saw the funeral pyres being lighted and attendants bringing bodies on stretchers, dipping them into the water, letting them rest with the feet immersed and the face cloth thrown back; for the dead are fortunate, they think, who have their last look on the sacred river. But temperament alone decides, perhaps, whether one shall see the bright rays of the rising sun illuminating the red stone palace of the Maharaja of Benares and gilding the domes of the many temples, the crowds, the color, the motion, the life; or whether one shall remember chiefly the superstition and degradation and filth, the unsanitary mingling of the dead and the living; or most marvel that here, as perhaps in no other place in the world, men clasp their hands in worship to the rising sun and a great

river, and repeat prayers to them as gods.

India is the saddest land I have ever seen. Yet I am not sure that the material wealth of my own country has produced much fundamental happiness for us of the West, nor peace of mind. Multiplicity of comforts does not answer the need of the soul for significant beauty, nor teach adjustment to life. In our eagerness to produce, we have found little time to possess our souls. In spite of India's failures to meet the tests by which we commonly measure civilization, India has a perception of life that is spiritually significant. It is the saint and ascetic, after all, who are the living ideal of India's millions. What other country supports, as India, over a million persons who have "renounced" life as a great illusion? What country, except India, would have allowed Gandhi, with his preaching of self-discipline, of non-violence, of fasting and prayer, to become the national leader? The masses of India are rich in their unconquerable love of the marvelous, out of which they fashion the ceaseless miracles of their gods. They have hallowed their own land with the beauty of imagination. Everywhere are the sacred spots about which myth and legend cling, and the humblest peasant in India becomes a pilgrim to the sacred shrines of his inheritance. For months in the wet season, the Indian cannot work; he becomes the possessor of infinite time. Not accomplishment, not progress, not happiness is the purpose of life, but the working out of a conscious relationship with spiritual truth. Out of narrow circumstance, the illiterate Indian finds escape in his mystic heart, where dwell the gods whom he worships. The greatest minds of India believe that no product of western energy, and no expression of our mechanistic genius, will solve the problem of the old questing for spiritual wisdom.

Changing Conventions and Divorce

Condensed from *Current Opinion* (March)

"In the last four years the marriage and divorce ratio has changed from four to one, to two to one."

We may not agree with all of the views expressed in this article, but it is of some significance that they are being discussed freely in the press, and elsewhere.

CRITICISM of marriage is as old as marriage itself. It is now assuming unwonted proportions, with a tendency in the direction indicated, years ago, by the Swedish feminist, Ellen Key, when she said, "Love without marriage is moral, but marriage without love is immoral," and has lately been emphasized by the erection in France of a monument, "To the Unmarried Mother." In England and in America it has taken the form of animated newspaper discussions looking toward a fundamental alteration of marriage laws.

The two most prominent of recent American critics of marriage have been Judge Ben B. Lindsey, of the Domestic Relations Court in Denver, and Mrs. Almon Hensley, former president of the New York Mothers' Club. Both disclaim a belief in free love, but both regard "free unions" sympathetically, and both affirm that changing conventions are preparing the way for a new and revolutionary sex ethics. Judge Lindsey states flatly in the *New York Times* that "as a social institution marriage has failed," and offers this support to his statements:

"We have got to face the most serious social problem of modern times. Do you know that for every marriage in Denver during 1922 there has been a separation? For every two mar-

riage licenses issued there has been a divorce suit filed. And what makes the tragedy so alarming is that what is true of Denver is true of every city in this country. What statistics prove of the West will hold good for the East. There is one thing we cannot get away from and that is the oneness of the American people.

"Think of it—in the last four years the marriage and divorce ratio has changed from four to one to two to one. These statistics show the number of separations arising from non-support and desertion which have come under the observation of my own Domestic Relations Court. Up to Dec. 16, 1922, 2,908 marriage licenses were issued and 1,492 divorce cases filed—the divorces 49.5 per cent of the marriage licenses. Now add to these my own figures, recording 1,500 cases of separation, and it makes the number almost 3,000—more separations and divorce cases filed than the total number of marriage licenses issued. Moreover, the year 1922 showed an increase of divorces over 1921 of 45, and a decrease in marriages of 618.

"Marriage is a failure because of changing conventions, and the conventions are changing because marriage is a failure. A factor making for these changes is the growing realization of young men and women that marriage is a failure. Youth instinctively shuns anything savoring of lack of success. The economic independence of women is another factor. The most significant reason for the present situation, however, is the broadening view-point of the present generation: its refusal to recognize as sin what convention has heretofore established as such. The whole thing is coming to a recognition of two standards—one that is and the other that is to be."

"And what is to be?" inquired the interviewer.

"That people may live together without being married in the conventional way," rang out the Judge's reply.

"You approve of this?"

"It is not a question of what I approve, but what is going to be. It is not a question of my approval, but what the failure of conventions has brought about."

He met the question, "What is to become of the child, according to your theories of unconventional mating?" in the following way:

"You seem to assume that the child is all right under the conventional marriage state. Let me assure you that ririage is not a guarantee for the future of the child. It is not even a guarantee of a father, because of the fathers separating from the mothers. In a recent survey of a typical American city, 32 per cent of legitimate children in a school had no father at home. These children were being brought up under artificial paternity. Please do not misunderstand me and think that I would abolish marriage. Far from it. But we must face a vital situation. Will we not be forced to the recognition—for the child's sake—of another standard?"

Mrs. Almon Hensley's views are in harmony with Judge Lindsey's sentiments. She thinks, as he does, that "there is no reason why an unmarried mother should be ostracized," and she predicts, within 50 years, a marriage contract "as easily entered into and as readily dissolved as the ordinary business agreement." She says:

"I advocate uniform and easier divorce laws. Our present State laws present a situation that is bewildering and farcical. One may be married in one State, a free man in another and a bigamist in a third.

"Constant nagging is a better justification for divorce, in my mind, than misconduct.

"In case of divorce the mother

should have the preference of having the children up to seven years. Older children should make their own choice of which parent they desire to live with.

"A marriage contract should specify that whenever a separation is desired by either party because of loss of love, it is to be granted with the right of remarriage."

Against the subversive views of Judge Lindsey and Mrs. Hensley should be set the attitude of Joseph Sabath, Judge of the Superior Court in Cook County, Illinois. Judge Sabath has tried about 6,500 divorce cases. He has presided over the Court of Domestic Relations in Chicago. And so far from conceding that marriage is a failure, he believes that the chief trouble with marriage is that "there isn't enough of it." His advice to the very young is to get married soon. "Don't wait until you are financially comfortable." However, he is strongly in favor of doing everything possible to discourage hasty marriages. He believes that the State should have something to say about the physical condition of applicants, and is not opposed to medical examination. Regarding divorce, he says: "We can hardly expect that all marriages will stick; but laws designed to limit divorce often defeat their own aims. The New York law, for instance, which grants divorce only on the ground of adultery, and prohibits it even then if it is found that there is any collusion between the parties, seems actually to cause more frame-ups than it prevents. There are six grounds for divorce in Illinois. All the States should have the same divorce laws.

"The law cannot guarantee happiness in marriage. The married individuals must go after it. They must learn what marriage is. They must learn its technique. They must learn how to play the game. The law may deal with the legal contracts involved, but only systematic education is able to deal with the more important factors involved."

Tenants Without Landlords

Condensed from *The New Republic* (Feb. 21)

1. Collective, non-profit ownership of homes proving successful.
2. 325 Brooklyn families pay \$9 per room rent.
3. Teachers have found the plan a boon.
4. The idea is spreading and is of general application.

OWN your own home" has been a popular slogan in America; but according to the Census Bureau 54 percent of the population in 1921 lived in rented houses, and the Secretary of Commerce reported in 1922 a housing shortage for 1,200,000 families. Individual home ownership, though still the rallying cry of innumerable land speculators, is an exploded panacea for the solution of the wage earners' housing problem. The worker pays instalments until a wave of unemployment sweeps him away, or, in the exceptional case he prospers, pays off on his house and rents it to a less fortunate worker at a substantial profit. He may then proceed to build another house and so pass gradually from the ranks of labor to receive the rewards of landlordism.

Can speculation be eliminated? It is being done, through cooperation. The principle of collective, non-profit making ownership of homes is being put into practice in the cooperative housing movement and has gained a substantial foothold during the past few years. The movement is gaining momentum constantly and gives promise of startling changes in the business of housing the wage workers of our cities and larger towns.

2. In 1918 a group of artisans organized the Finnish Home Building

Association in Brooklyn and built two 16-family apartment houses. The tenants pay \$27 for five-room apartments which would have rented for \$70 and \$80 under private management—and still had sufficient surplus at the end of each year to pay off \$1,000 on the mortgages. During the last four years seven more such houses have been built or remodelled, providing homes for 116 families. During the same time other groups of workers have been buying or building eleven additional apartment houses in adjoining neighborhoods, and this winter are building two more. Here are 22 buildings, housing altogether 325 families, and rentals average not more than \$9 per room monthly. These tenants made initial payments of only a few hundred dollars for shares in their housing associations, and the balance of the properties is covered by mortgages which are being paid off in ten or twenty years.

This example has been followed by many other Brooklyn wage earners in other sections. A group of eight families bought an old house for \$16,000, paying \$3,000 down and carrying \$13,000 on mortgages. They are now paying \$25 to \$30 a month rent, which provides enough surplus above running expenses to pay off \$2,400 annually on the mortgages and leaves \$364 for a reserve fund. At 466 Forty-ninth Street, sixteen tenants are paying \$24 and \$30 for cooperative apartments that would cost \$50 if rented from a landlord; and this rental provides a surplus from which they are improving their property.

3. In Manhattan the movement is making similar headway. A group of teachers owns a house and manages it cooperatively on West Sixty-fifth Street. They have installed a

cooperative restaurant and a cooperative laundry as well. Farther up-town several groups of teachers and students are living in cooperative houses. One, the Stockbridge Apartments, with tenant-membership of twenty-four, is typical. The apartments here have six and seven rooms and rents range from \$75 to \$105. The Beekman Hill Cooperative Association is another excellent cooperative apartment house. A short distance from it a similar group is now planning the erection of a house for forty families. Again, there are three cooperative houses for single people, two for men and one for women. These people support many recreational and educational activities in their own buildings.

4. These are a few examples of the cooperative housing enterprises that are constantly springing into existence in many parts of Greater New York, the city in which the pioneering has been done. But the idea has carried westward and taken root in several cities and towns. The most interesting experiment is being made in the city of Milwaukee by the Garden Homes Company. Twenty-eight acres of land were purchased early in 1922 and work started on ninety stucco houses. The cost of this enterprise was to be \$500,000, one half raised by sale of preferred stock to the city, the county, and private business interests; the other half common stock sold to tenants. Each tenant subscribes for common stock equal to the value of his house. As rapidly as this stock is paid up, the preferred stock is retired. When this process has worked through to its conclusion the tenants will come into full collective ownership and control of their common property. The tenants of these cooperative homes pay about \$50 a month at first, which includes 5 per cent interest on the preferred stock and \$120 a year toward its retirement; but each year these items decrease until monthly rents finally fall to less than \$25.

The Milwaukee Plan has aroused particular interest because of cer-

tain unique features. Fire, life and accident insurance payments are included in the monthly rentals. At the end of the year the last monthly rent payment will be remitted to the tenant after deductions have been made for cost of any repairs to the property—a device intended to encourage the tenant to keep his premises in good condition. Each house has plenty of air space and light. A park, gardens and playgrounds for the children are included in the landscape plans. Without doubt the value of the land will increase greatly after the houses are completed and occupied; but the increase in value will go to the whole group. No individual is permitted to sell his shares in the cooperative association at a profit; and if he is compelled to leave the city he must sell the shares back to the association.

Cooperative housing that is genuinely cooperative always eliminates speculation in this manner, and at the same time increases home ownership. Individual ownership of homes does not eliminate speculation, and too often it only turns good workers into real estate promoters or landlords.

Most of the so-called "Cooperative Plans" described in the real estate supplements of the Sunday newspapers are absolutely non-cooperative in everything but name. Usually the buyer is sold a single apartment and receives a deed to the property. The tenants have no collective ownership or control over the entire house. Other housing plans semi-cooperative in nature, also are numerous. They permit of cooperative ownership and control, but usually do not demand equality of voting privileges.

The housing problem of America is vast and Protean, and it will not be conquered in a day. The cooperative solution is new and easily overlooked by the public. But few who examine it will deny that it offers a real solution, and one that is capable of general application.

The Reader's Digest

"All Wool and a Yard Wide"

Adapted from Good Housekeeping (Mar.) and Success (Mar.)

The subject of clothes is one from which none of us can escape. Here is an article that will enlighten you on a number of points worth remembering.

HERE is a fight on; and it happens to be your fight, whether you are man, woman or child, because it concerns your pocketbook. The principle involved is merely that of common honesty. Shall the manufacturer and the merchant be compelled to brand goods truthfully? Or shall gum, tin and coal tar be sold as silk, and garments made of shoddy as all wool? Food is now branded as to weight and content, though not as to quality. Clothing may be anything, and generally isn't what it is called.

Let us therefore consider the French-Capper Truth-in-Fabric bill, now pending in Congress, not merely for what it is, a law which would effectually prevent misrepresentation of the material used in woolen textiles, but what it promises—an extension of the same sound principle throughout all branches of manufacturing and merchandising.

The idiom, "all wool and a yard wide," has become meaningless. Some years ago the public revolted against the manufacturers who sold mixtures of wool and cotton as "all wool," and the manufacturers proceeded to dodge the public's wrath by the elimination of cotton, and the substitution of wool shoddy in its place. As wool shoddy is cheaper than middling cotton, the public was more completely swindled than before. "Shoddy" wool is second-hand wool which has lost strength and resiliency through use. It may have been reclaimed seven or eight

times by the rag-man, and each time the fibre becomes shorter, deader, more brittle. Cloth made from enough new wool to hold the shoddy together, and sold as "all wool" may look as well as cloth made wholly of unused wool. But it will not wear as well, and is generally inferior to a mixture of unused wool and cotton, which may be made into a strong fabric, with less liability to shrinkage. Owing to the world shortage in wool, the use of shoddy and cotton mixtures is perhaps a necessity. The objectionable element is the misrepresentation by which the public is compelled to pay the price of sound woolen cloth for a mixture of new wool and worn out rags. The salesman tells you truthfully, "Absolutely all wool, every thread of it," and you pay perhaps \$75 for a suit. Eight or ten weeks later you are wearing a shapeless coat worn at the elbows and wrists, trousers baggy at the knees, and a suit that to a casual observer might have cost \$30. Today two-thirds of the raw material used in making "all wool" clothing is shoddy, not virgin wool. Take any old, worn, used woolen rags fished out of gutters, back-yards, or tailors' shops, make them into wool fabric, using a little virgin wool, and, of course, you have a cheap fabric. *Shoddy costs the manufacturers from 20 to 50 cents. Virgin wool costs from 70 cents to \$2 a pound.* And remember this: *Whether you pay \$25 or \$75 for a suit, it may be made largely, almost entirely, of shoddy—and you have no way of knowing it. Not the shrewdest judge of cloth in the world can prior to service, detect the presence of shoddy in woolen fabrics. This means that you are charged a high price for a garment that may be 90 percent shoddy, but which you believe to be virgin wool!*

This explodes any idea you may have that garments containing shoddy are sold only at low prices in cheap stores. It has been conclusively proved that some of the most costly garments contain more shoddy than virgin wool. That is why most of the clothes you buy today cost so much and wear so badly. Neither the merchant nor the manufacturer is trying to deceive you; they themselves do not know when they buy the garment or the raw material how much shoddy is present in the cloth. No test known to science can, before the garment is worn, reveal its presence.

The only way is to wear the garment—and then, of course, it is too late. After a short time it gets threadbare, becomes baggy, wrinkles easily. When the short shoddy fibres are found in the bottom of your coat, inside the lining, leaving the surface of the cloth threadbare—then you know that you have bought a garment containing a large percentage of shoddy.

The dependability of any wool cloth is based on the length, life, and resiliency of the wool fibre. A virgin-wool garment has long fibres which make the cloth springy; it does not lose its shape because the fibre, temporarily stretched, springs back to its original shape. A suit made of virgin wool does not wrinkle easily for the same reason; expose the garment to air, and it gets back its "life," the wrinkles disappearing. Moreover, because the fibre is long and strong, it does not wear threadbare at wrists and elbows.

This preposterous fraud of shoddy garments has been foisted on you—and will continue to be—unless the French-Capper bill is passed. This law, if passed, will make it compulsory to mark every garment and all woolen fabrics sold, stating that the cloth contains "not more" than a certain per cent of reworked wool, cotton, or silk and "not less" than a cer-

tain per cent of virgin wool. The bill does not object to the use of shoddy—if the public is told that it is shoddy. Shoddy is, for certain uses, very satisfactory. But *shoddy is cheap, and garments made from shoddy ought to be sold, therefore, for low prices, but they are not.* This bill will set up a standard for judging qualities. If you know that a garment contains no more than 70 percent shoddy, and no less than 30 percent virgin wool, you can then use your own intelligence to determine if you are being charged a fair price.

Few people realize how this fraudulent selling of shoddy as virgin wool has menaced the sheep industry of the United States. Despite the fact of increased population, creating increased demands for virgin wool, the sheep population of the world has steadily declined. For more than a decade only one-third enough virgin wool has been produced to make the wool cloth that is manufactured each year. Experts have predicted that if shoddy and virgin wool continue to be sold as "all wool," the substitution of shoddy will inevitably destroy the sheep industry. This means that when the available woolen rags are all used up, if no virgin wool is produced, we shall be without woolen fabrics of any kind.

Naturally, the shoddy interests are vigorously fighting the pending bill. But it is assumed that those manufacturers who unconditionally guarantee the serviceability of their products use only virgin wool of the best quality, and these are the ones who have most to gain, for the law would drag out into the light the unscrupulous manufacturer who labels his semi-worthless cloth "all wool" and is thus enabled to compete unfairly with the producer of virgin wool garments. The French-Capper law, with trademarks indicating quality, should usher in a new day for grower, manufacturer, and buyer.

Restriction in Our Colleges

Condensed from Hearst's International (March)

Arthur Gleason

Our colleges "have a culture, a tradition, a spiritual growth, which can be invaded and destroyed by alien numbers. There is a point of saturation. For the public good the privately endowed colleges must preserve their individuality."

HARVARD has done a useful thing in forcing the discussion of the function of the American college. The policy of drastic limitation of the number of Jews has been practiced in recent years at several colleges. As yet Harvard has taken no final action. The question has been raised because it is said there has been an increase of Jews in recent years at Harvard from 6 or 7 percent to between 15 and 20 percent. Among the reasons for this increase are: the increased Jewish population now sending the second generation to college; the eagerness of the Jew for learning; the prestige of Harvard.

President Lowell dealt with the problem in a letter to a Jew and a Harvard graduate:

"There is, most unfortunately, a rapidly growing anti-Semitic feeling in this country, causing — and no doubt in part caused by — a strong race feeling on the part of the Jews themselves. The question for those of us who deplore such a state of things is how it can be combated, and how those of us connected with colleges can cause the Jews to feel and be regarded as an integral part of the student body. The anti-Semitic feeling among the students is increasing, and it grows in proportion to the increase in the number of the Jews.

If their number should become 40 percent of the student body, the race feeling would become intense. When, on the other hand, the number of Jews was small, the race antagonism was small also. Any such race feeling among the students tends to prevent the personal intimacies on which we must rely to soften anti-Semitic feeling. If every college in the country would take a limited proportion of Jews, I suspect we should go a long way toward eliminating race feeling among the students, and, as these students passed out into the world, eliminating it in the community."

The clearest statement in favor of limitation was made to me by Dr. Richard C. Cabot, head of the Department of Social Ethics. He said:

"The old idea for this country was that of the melting pot, where all racial variations were to be melted down to a standardized substance. To this idea of Americanization I am opposed. What we want in this country are the many qualities of the many racial stocks. What we want is the harmony of an orchestra, not the unison of one note. Where strongly marked groups exist, they must be related to each other as a harmonious whole. There was a time before the Civil War when Harvard was dominated by the 'unreconstructable Southerner'—as pure an American type as we have ever had. But it was a sharply differentiated group, and it needed limitation. The Irish Roman Catholic is another strongly marked group. Most of them go to their own colleges. I hope some at least will always continue to come to Harvard. If a college had 40 percent of Irish Roman Catholics, or unreconstructed Southerners, or Japanese student group — it would not be an

American college in the sense of an harmonious whole. One instrument would be outshouting all the others. I don't worship chance. If music were left to chance, there would be no harmony. But in creating an orchestra for the American college, the job has thus far been left to chance. I think we should limit every group which presents a clearly marked psychological type. If there were a rush of Americans to Oxford, Oxford would be right in saying they must limit the number of Americans, because of wishing many different elements in their community. The Jews do not wish a purely Jewish university—they wish to be a group in an all-American university. Hence what I have suggested is, I believe, in the interest of the Jews. I am not an anti-Semite; I regard the Jewish group as superior to my own group. For all that, they are too strong for harmony when their numbers swarm."

The older Jews were the descendants of Spanish, Portuguese and German Jews. There has now arrived a new Polish Jew, said to be objectionable. This inferiority is the result of the ghetto environment of the parents. . . . With the increase of numbers of Jews in Harvard, a herding together has followed, and with it a separation. The senior Jews are largely segregated in one dormitory. There used to be no Jewish organizations and fraternities in Harvard, and now there are half a dozen or more. This is the fact the Jews refuse to face—that, if present in large numbers, they form a separate group. They ask to be treated as individuals, but they form a group. . . . There is a culture in a place like Harvard, a tradition, a spiritual growth, which can be invaded and destroyed by alien numbers. There is a point of saturation. For the public good the privately endowed colleges must preserve their individuality.

An individuality is a delicate and precious thing, easily invaded. Down the ages, the Jews themselves have

protected their group identity, and conceded the right to exclude what is a danger to their individuality. That distinguished Jew, Samuel Gompers, and his executive council, have not been the least of those who have effectually advocated restriction of immigration. Heaven pity the poor immigrant in the clothing trade at time of strike who does not subscribe to the theory and practice of industrial unionism. Jewish trade unionists protect themselves with high success against alien invasion. Solidarity of organization means more to them than democratic phrases.

Closely allied to this matter of tradition is the wish to preserve the college as the home of culture, giving success in the world of manners. This argument is not basic or widely used, but is heard occasionally. Certain Jews are physically disagreeable to the eye of the well-born. They are Kikes. They "get the best of you." They are Shylocks. They lack sensitiveness. Let a few of them in, and the whole tribe follows. They push their way into conveyances. They hog the road. This little minority have the worst manners in Christendom. They are not socially correct.

Just the right Jews in small doses the college leaders can tolerate. Jews of fine old Southern family are among the elite of the University of Virginia. A Jew who is rich, charming and athletic will win social distinction in an American college.

In a few great cities the Jews of America are massed. In or near these cities are several of the large privately-endowed colleges. But they are not local public institutions. They are national public institutions, and have obligations to a wide geography. It is the job of another kind of college, a municipal and state institution, to relieve this abnormal pressure.

The case against Restriction will be presented by Mr. Gleason in Hearst's International for April.

The Reader's Digest

Imperative Educational Reforms

Condensed from Current History (March)

Dr. Charles W. Eliot

A N essential principle of democracy is the right of every child to receive as much education as he can take in and hold during youth. Many people think of education as if it were an affair of childhood only, ceasing with maturity. Far from it. The true education is that which implants and develops the love of accurate knowledge, truth and liberty, coupled with the sense of duty and responsibility, and also supplies and trains skill, personal power and enjoyment of work. An education which fails to increase enjoyment, as well as to give power, is somehow wrong. A training which is not interesting and stimulating to child or adult is somehow wrong.

Neither Athens at the climax of Greek letters and art, nor Rome during the short-lived republic, imagined any system of popular education. Only very exceptional human beings, now in one age or country and now in another, have attained it; and then or there only because of their own genius, and not through the action of governmental or social forces. Both the Greek Church and the Roman Catholic Church developed and fostered the fine arts — architecture, sculpture, painting and music—but only for the ecclesiastical and religious influences and enjoyments, and not with any educational purpose, unless for the exceptional individuals who were capable of becoming masters in those arts. Not till the Protestant Reformation did priests and rulers, like Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII, urge that the common people should learn to read, that they might be able to read the Scriptures translated into the native tongue.

The Pilgrims and Puritans implanted a faith in popular education that has spread across the continent. But what a defective education, and how disappointing its results! The larger the country, the more heterogeneous the population as respects race, religion and historical experience; and the greater the power exercised directly by ignorant and inexperienced voters, the greater the dangers to which the American democracy will find itself exposed.

The World War and the state of the country the last five years have exposed the conditions of large sections of the American people as regards illiteracy, ill-health, bodily and mental defects and delinquency. As for the melting pot in this country, so far as I can see, there is no melting pot, or ever has been. In fact, the continued separateness of the different alien peoples that have come to America is the most striking phenomenon of our heterogeneousness. All thinking people see that the free schools of the country have not been so conducted as to make American democracy safe. The children and youth have not been adequately trained, either physically or morally; they have been left ignorant of subjects essential to the proper discharge of their duties toward family, community and nation; they have not been introduced to the fine arts; they have been provided with no sure defenses against irrational credulity, insidious propaganda and herd impulses. Many Americans, now adult, who were ill-served by the schools of their childhood have learned little or nothing since.

Sensible people, however, seeing defects, set themselves to remedying

them. All thinking people who believe that democracy is the best form of government the world has ever seen because it leaves every citizen free to do his best for the public welfare should use all their influence so to change the free schools' programs that every pupil should receive a thorough physical training, a sound ethical training, and instruction in drawing, modeling and music, in cooking, diet and hygiene, in the elements of family and community economics and in the value of cooperative management and discipline in industries and society.

Doubtless the most important of all these improvements in the public schools is the introduction of sound instruction in the principles and aims of universal ethics. The present exclusion of training in ethics from all public schools is one of the most unfortunate results of the toleration in religion which was embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and of the multiplicity of religions and sects in this country. A feasible mode of giving instruction in universal ethics in the free schools has yet to be invented. The problem is to select a body of material for ethical instruction which Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews can agree upon for use in the schools, this material to include selections from the Scriptures, stories, fables, hymns and other poetry, drama and music. There is no better field for philanthropic and patriotic endeavor.

It will take years to put all American children in possession of this kind of education; because a new breed of teachers must first be raised by the hundred thousand, and also because the people have to learn that they should spend much more money than they have been accustomed to spend on the public schools. Teachers have to be trained who lead rather than drive, who know that the only healthy and promising child is the eager, restless, inquiring, and busy child, and who encourage their pupils to incessant activity of body and

mind, and to learn by "doing." Schools conducted on these principles will cost much more than the schools which the American communities have heretofore been content with; because they will require more building space per pupil, more open ground about the schoolhouse, more tools, apparatus and supplies, and fewer pupils to the teacher. One of the most grievous results of the inadequacy of American free schools is that the democracy yearly spends billions on luxuries, some of them noxious, and yet refuses to spend thousands on prime necessities like education and public health. All patriots should urge more money for the public schools.

Among the objects of modern democracy a wiser and more effective education should hold the second place, the first object being the increase of freedom and comfort for the entire population, and its deliverance from chronic fears. A strong reason for urging a better education for the whole people is that applied science has lately facilitated combinations of ignorant or foolish citizens who quickly get together to promote their selfish interests, or to put into practice unsound theories. Universal suffrage and the initiative and referendum make this condition all the more dangerous. The youth of today appear to be abandoning some of the safeguards which seemed important to their parents or grandparents. Whether the present higher pressure conditions are to lead to a moral decline or a moral revival, no social or religious philosopher can possibly predict. Meantime the American public, young and old, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, are just as ready to squander their money on magicians, astrologers, quacks, suggesters, healers and false prophets as ever pagan or medieval public was—a complete demonstration that American popular education has thus far been seriously defective.

Free Speech—A Social Safety Valve

Condensed from *The Century Magazine* (March)

Glenn Frank, Editor of The Century

In the preceding article, Doctor Eliot states that our educational system provides "no sure defense against irrational credulity, insidious propaganda and herd impulses." If such be the case, a consideration of the question of free speech is an especially vital one.

GOVERNOR SMITH recently issued a full pardon for Jim Larkin, the revolutionary labor leader, who has been serving a five-year term in Sing Sing for violation of the criminal anarchy act. This statute provides that any person advocating the overthrow of organized government "by force or violence. . . or by any other means," is guilty of a felony. Larkin was charged with having joined in issuing the manifesto of ultra-radical Socialists which counseled a change of our form of government to what is described as the "dictatorship of the proletariat," and advocated that this change be achieved by strikes designed to affect the political action of the electorate.

I knew, of course, that this pardon was not inspired by any agreement on the part of Governor Smith with the views of the Irish labor leader. I knew that it must have been inspired by some fundamental conception of the relation of free speech and censorship to the processes of sound democratic government. This was confirmed when I saw Governor Smith's public statement:

My present action in no way involves the slightest agreement with this manifesto. I condemn the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the farmers, of the capi-

talists, of the merchants, or of any other section of the community. Likewise, I condemn the project to coerce political action by any such method as the calling of general strikes. Labor has the right to strike for the purpose of securing reasonable improvement of its own conditions, but not for the purpose of driving other groups into the acceptance of a proposed political dictatorship. I pardon Larkin, therefore, despite my disagreement with Larkin's views. Moreover, there is no evidence that Larkin ever endeavored to incite any specific act of violence or lawlessness. His offence was nothing more than the issuance of a misguided opinion that in the remote future our system of government should be changed by a process abhorrent to our institutions. Our state rests too firmly upon the devotion of its citizens to require for its protection an imprisonment of five years for the mere expression of an erroneous political doctrine, unaccompanied by any overt act. Moreover, I believe that the safety of the state is affirmatively impaired by the imposition of such a sentence for such a cause. Political progress results from the clash of conflicting opinions. The public assertion of an erroneous doctrine is perhaps the surest way to disclose the error and make it evident to the electorate. And it is a distinct disservice of the state to impose, for the utterance of a misguided opinion, such extreme punishment as may tend to deter, in proper cases, that full and free discussion of political issues which is a fundamental of democracy.

I regard this as a state paper of singular significance at this particular time, and I think I am rendering a distinct service to the future in seeing to it that it is assured a permanent place in the files of *The Century Magazine*. It throws the white light of intelligence upon certain policies which have disgraced American politics ever since, during the war, we began to confuse intolerance with patriotism. We should long since have granted a general amnesty to all political prisoners who were imprisoned during the war for the utterance of radical ideas that ran

counter to majority opinion. I am glad that Governor Smith has based his policy upon the fundamentally sound contention that the safety of the state depends upon freedom of speech, press, assembly, and instruction. Conservatives have as much at stake as radicals in the preservation of the complete freedom of speech. I believe that America has far more to fear from the violence of repression than it has to fear from the violence of revolt. Forceable government repression of minority utterance, as Lord Macaulay long ago suggested, takes away from the rattlesnake the rattle by which it warns you of its approach, but leaves it with the sting by which it kills you. It is of vital importance that, as a people, we force ourselves to think clearly upon this issue of the freedom of speech, press, assembly, and instruction, for this problem is coming more and more to the fore.

I believe that, just as a germ dies in the sunlight, but thrives in the fetid air of a dungeon, so radical ideas are less dangerous to the existing order when expressed than when repressed. As Justice Holmes said: "With radical ideas, as with champagnes, the best way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to the air." In this sense free speech, if I may scramble metaphors, is a social safety-valve.

I believe that progress depends more upon our safeguarding the rights of heresy than upon the protection of orthodoxy. Every forward step in history, in the very nature of the case, had to begin with an attack upon the then existing order. Had effective means for preserving the status quo existed from the dawn of human history, we should today probably be chasing one another through the forest with clubs. This is frayed platitude, but unless we base our conceptions of government upon it, we are doomed either to political and social stagnation, on the one hand, or to riotous revolution on the other.

I believe that "the cost of liberty is less than the cost of repression." I am not arguing that there are no risks involved in free speech, but that a policy of no risks is more risky. Russia took no risks with freedom of thought, speech, assembly, and instruction. Germany, under the Hohenzollerns, took few such risks. Today, the most distinguished apostles of thought control in both countries are in exile, stripped of their glory. Most advocates of revolution have, or at least think they have, a grievance. It is in the interest of orderly progress that they should be given a hearing. If the grievance is imaginary, we should then pit our brains against his to prove to him that his grievance is imaginary. To deny him a hearing is the one sure way to convince him that force and violence is the only language left to him. Repression is, in actual results, a subsidy for unrest.

I believe that if the American people are incapable of self-protection in the face of error, they are incapable of self-government. The founders and fashioners of American democracy believed this. Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions that I wish it always to be kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all." Lincoln expressed a similar belief in his first inaugural address. Both men evidently did not believe that the people are so utterly lacking in common sense and self-control that every time they hear a radical proposal made they immediately proceed to set fire to all of their own property, put bombs under the village banks, and string up on lamp-posts every man in town who has brains enough to accumulate as much as thirty cents in a long business career.

This issue will become more and more urgent; hence it is well to suggest that repression is not the safeguard it is advertised to be.

Radicalism vs. Government

Condensed from The North American Review (March)

Ben W. Hooper

This article and the two preceding ones make a series that is particularly provocative and timely.

HEFORE we have had only long-range knowledge of the Radicalism that prevailed in many of the countries of Europe. The meagre reports and discussions of Anarchy, Communism, Socialism, and Bolshevism across the sea have aroused but mild and casual interest in this country, until today we are face to face with similar problems of increasing gravity. Today, there is a Babel of strange voices in our land, preaching new doctrines that will not square with the Constitution handed down to us by our forefathers. Although there is no occasion for immediate alarm, there is ample cause for serious thought and prompt action. Radicalists have increased enormously within the last few years, and their activities have been tremendously enlarged. The class hatred that is engendered by their publications, the disloyalty to the Government and the seething discontent, are beyond all calculation. The business man who sees these radical sheets, when he stops to buy an evening paper at a news stand, does not accord them a passing thought. But because they do not touch him does not mean that they do not poison anybody else. They are read in various languages and implicitly accepted by hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions of people.

There is, moreover, a genuine cause of uneasiness in the fact that

a large and influential element of people in this country are headed toward socialistic Radicalism, without being aware of it. A very positive movement is on foot to throw the forces of organized labor into politics as allies of Socialism. This is merely a duplication of what has already occurred in various countries abroad. The leaders of this movement do not now call themselves Socialists, but the socialistic trend of their activities is quite obvious. This new political movement of organized labor is controlled by certain leaders of most of the railway labor organizations who have formed a working agreement with the Socialists and other radical groups. Samuel Gompers has let it be known that he is not a Socialist, but the majority of the railroad labor organization are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, of which Gompers is the head. The railway employees alone, numbering 2,000,000, would constitute a formidable vote en bloc.

The financial resources of these labor organizations are great and potentially enormous. A railway union expended \$350,000 in the holding of its national convention in 1922. One union owns a bank capitalized at a million dollars, has recently purchased valuable coal lands, and pays its chief a salary of \$25,000 a year. Several of them own pretentious buildings in which they maintain elaborate headquarters, and have assets running into the millions. Each of the organizations publishes its own magazine, and the railway unions jointly publish a weekly paper in Washington that is purely political and that nearly all of the organizations send to their entire member-

ship. These facts are not mentioned as criticism but as showing the power of these organizations and the fact that they are not posing as the economic underdogs and "wage-slaves" of the present industrial system. And so far as discernible, there is no great amount of sentiment among railway employees for Socialism. Even labor leaders do not propose entrance into the Socialist party — merely cooperation with it. The Socialists naturally expect this first step to be followed later by others. What pleases the Socialists most is that the leaders of a large majority of the railway unions have launched an aggressive campaign for government ownership of railroads under the Plumb Plan, and they are utilizing their official magazines for spreading propaganda to this end.

The whole movement of the labor leaders is driving directly toward one point — to remove from the statute books of the United States and from the Constitution every vestige of law and legal machinery that is designed to restrain strikers from the use of physical force and to regulate their use of economic power in the enforcement of their demands against employers and the public. With this purpose fairly well accomplished, our Government would become one of force rather than law, and chaos would indeed reign. In the first place, the revolutionary proposal is made to empower Congress to set aside a decision of the Supreme Court which declares an act of Congress unconstitutional. The radicals who are always eager to tinker with established institutions have no patience with the thoughtful and deliberate methods of a court. When they desire the quick enactment even of an unconstitutional law, they rage against the court which declares it so. Yet it should be evident that a parliamentary body, composed of a large percentage, of men comparatively unfamiliar with the Constitution and laws of the country, is not fitted to pass judgment upon the constitutionality of a

statute. Such a question is a judicial one of the highest type and should no more be referred to a legislative body than any other function of the judiciary. This proposal means nothing more nor less than the complete wiping out of our written Constitution. The Constitution would be made the sport of the rising and falling tides of inconstant public sentiment as reflected in successive, short-lived congresses.

As a corollary to this proposition, the demand is made that the courts should be deprived of the injunctive powers exercised in connection with strikes. This means simply that the labor leaders desire that strikers shall possess the unfettered license to destroy property and to intimidate and assault those who exercise the right to do the work that the strikers have abandoned. It means that the courts of our land must stand shackled in the presence of insolent and triumphant force. It means that the strongest safeguard of life, liberty and property known to our republic must be broken down in order that the onrush of the frenzied mob may not be obstructed. Not often has the injunctive power been perverted from its proper use. In tens of thousands of instances it has protected the weak against the mighty, the law-abiding against the lawless. The people of this country know that strikes degenerate nine times out of ten into crude, raw, naked, hideous physical force. Indeed, it is known that only in rare instances can a strike succeed without the accompaniment of violence. In the recent railroad strike, the new workers were besieged inside their blockades. Bombs were thrown, murders and assaults committed. Then, when the Attorney-General, after the careful gathering of evidence, resorted to the courts for the defense of the lives of the workers there arose a demagogical outcry against the courts, the Department of Justice and the power of injunction.

(To be continued)

The Reader's Digest

Men and Half-Men

Condensed from Scribner's Magazine (March)

Seth K. Humphrey

"The sorry rabble follow the specious promises of the political shyster, and through him they are already near to holding the balance of power in our city elections. Their increasing numbers predict a still easier day for the political demagogue."

IT'S a fine prospect—for the political demagogue and the bolshevik agitator—that perhaps one-half of all children born are derived from the lowest one-sixth of the population. The quality of the race is declining; but it needed the spectacular figures of the army's careful and very complete mental tests to show how far the decline has already proceeded.

Those who write on the subject propose many remedies for stopping racial decline. By all sorts of expedients, ranging from lofty appeal to a cash bonus from the State, the best of the race are to be persuaded away from their too great caution and will forthwith take to having large families; while the poorly endowed are to be enjoined—somehow—from reproducing their kind with their usual careless freedom. Thus, and so, will the high birth-rate be shifted from the poorer to the better stocks, and our dwindling racial values be enriched. These proposals, however, show a decidedly faint appreciation of the difficulties in the way of one who sets out to tinker with the fundamental instinct of the human race.

We can get a line on what we are likely to do toward reducing the fe-

cundity of fifteen or twenty-five millions of the mentally inferior by observing what we have done, after years of strenuous effort, toward cutting off the self-reproduction of that very much smaller group of incompetents, the obviously feeble-minded. This class constitutes probably between 1 and 2 per cent of the population. The official estimate for Massachusetts is about 40,000—just over 1 per cent. Of these 40,000 Massachusetts has segregated in her two institutions only 3,000, one out of thirteen. This is after years of the most intensive public agitation over the damage done to racial values through turning back into the stock the prolific increase of the mentally unfit.

The mountain's labor brought forth a mouse. A community well posted on what would happen to its fancy strains of dogs or flowers through the presence of one ill-favored specimen in the breeding area, still takes the miserable outpourings of its feeble-minded without batting an eyelash.

Massachusetts is no more impervious to the dictates of ordinary common sense in this respect than most of the States. A few States, perhaps, have done better; those which have segregated as many as one-fifth of their cases seem to derive a virtuous pride from the thought that only four out of five of their defectives are polluting the race. Our failure with the country's million feeble-minded would be ridiculous if it were not so tragic.

Then why waste words over discussing how to reduce the fecundity of a score of millions in the mental grades just above, who are not even candidates for segregation? The rest

of this article will not indulge the conceit that we alone, of all the experimenters with civilization, are to escape racial decadence. Nothing in human experience has been more clearly demonstrated than the utter falsity of the popular idea that education and training can somehow develop people with stunted mentalities into normal, upstanding men and women. A vast deal of effort may make them less of a burden, but we've got to carry them.

But even with these admissions, lugubrious wailing is at least untimely. Every previous culture came to its most exquisite flowering with 70, 80, 90 per cent of its peoples as incapable and incoherent as our lowest 25 per cent. The magnificent structures of Egypt, Babylon, Greece, and Rome were built, not in spite of, but because of, their immense numbers who were fitted only for the simplest manual labor under close supervision. Previous cultures invited in, or compelled, foreign peoples in large numbers to do their menial work, who remained to multiply and plague them with their inferiority. We read of the ancients that the original stocks which primarily developed their cultures failed to perpetuate their inheritances. This is the commonest of our own racial faults; today we have isolated communities of old American stocks so long drained of their best men and women that their mental average is hardly above that of our least desirable foreign elements.

But a nation's cultural development depends solely on its geniuses—the merest fraction of its numbers; it is little impressed by the masses of its mediocrity. Racial damage begins with civilization's first protecting of its defective stocks; but culture goes on for hundreds of years after this damage has become as obvious as it has with us. Survival is largely a question of preserving the nation's integrity under an increasing load of the incapable.

How did previous cultures manage? Certainly not by inviting their incompetents to take a hand in the choosing of leadership. Neither can we. Why mince words? It should be self-evident that a complex democracy like ours cannot go on with a large and increasing proportion of child-mentalities in its electorate. These are not electors—somebody else does the electing with their votes. They follow the specious promises of the demagogue, and through him they are already near to holding the balance of power in our city elections. Their increasing numbers predict a still easier day for the political shyster.

We have reached the point of heterogeneity where some qualification for citizenship is needed beyond those got up for the old town meeting. We want no electorate made up with distinctions as to property, position, creed, color, or sex—or education, except that the voter should be able to read English; but we do have a right to know that every voter has in him at least the innate makings of a competent citizen. A properly devised mental test would give us just this kind of an electorate. Not a single radical who has enough brains to think for himself would be barred; but enough of the sorry rabble that votes as the demagogue thinks would be put out to give us a chance at decent city government. Once freed from this collective vote of the unreasoning, the reasonable demands of all the people could be better expressed at the polls, and more fearlessly carried out by those whom they elect.

Industries, schools, colleges, and all sorts of institutions are developing mental tests adapted to their particular needs. The thing will be misused, abused, and finally perfected for an inestimable service to mankind. The next important application of this new method for grading human quality will doubtless be with our immigrants. But its crowning usefulness will come with its application to the electorate.

The Reader's Digest

Where Government Operation Works

Condensed from *The Outlook* (Feb. 28)

Colonel Jay J. Morrow, Governor of the Panama Canal

Successful government operation — The finest organization in the world today — The greatest danger that threatens the Canal — An appeal to Americans to prize what they have and be on guard.

THE Panama Canal is the realization of one of the dreams of the centuries. The first of the past two decades showed in the face of overwhelming difficulties the achievement of construction of one of the greatest works of man. The second of the two decades has been occupied by a struggle to retain what we have conquered, as the forces of nature are ever resisting control by man. Into the building of the great work were woven the enthusiasm and constructive genius of our highest type of men, and this spirit still lives. Indeed, there are in the operating force many of those of construction days, and these, though diminishing in numbers, have succeeded in passing on to the successors of the old-timers that have gone this same pride in the work.

Few Americans have any adequate idea of what our Government has done and is doing in the Canal Zone. Here one finds a very conspicuous example of successful government operation, due, in no small measure, to wise legislation vesting practically all functions in the Canal Zone in a Governor, appointed by the President and removable at his pleasure. This centralization of administrative power under the Governor was not accidentally done; its wisdom was indicated by all the troubles which hampered construction until President

Roosevelt took the action which made Goethals the Czar of the Zone. There was then no question of responsibility, no delay in any necessary action. Construction was successfully completed, and operation has been successful for the same reason. Efforts have been made to transfer some of the government functions to the Federal departments charged with similar work in the States, but, so far, and wisely, without success. It is not generally known, but such functions as quarantine, customs inspection, postal service, shipping commissioner and steamship inspection service, lighthouse service, meteorological and hydrographic service, and prohibition enforcement, are entirely disassociated from our National services, and are handled by the Governor of the Canal. The result is a smoothly working whole into which all these functions are made to fit with the most important work of transiting ships, all operating for economy, for elimination of useless red tape and friction, and particularly for efficiency, as it is infinitely easier to supervise these operations by a directing head at the Zone rather than in Washington.

The Panama Canal, by this same law, is charged with other functions of a governmental nature, such as the regulation of all traffic in the two terminal ports, the operation of police and fire services; courts, jails, hospitals, schools, waterworks, street paving, sewers, and health service both in the Canal Zone and in the cities of Panama and Colon. And aside from getting the ships through the Canal, they must be served. So it is necessary to operate fuel services (coal, oil, Diesel oil, and gasoline), to operate shops with a dry dock for ship repair, to carry all man-

ner of ships' stores, and to maintain a seagoing salvage service for ships in distress. Our employees also must be housed and fed — a big business in itself. The Panama Railroad, built 60 years ago by American capital as a trans-isthian rail line, and later expanded to include a steamship line, is owned by the United States. The steamship line serves as a supply line for the Canal and as a transportation line for employees traveling home and back for necessary leaves. It also does a commercial business to give it return cargoes, and has made very considerable profits in the 19 years of Government ownership. The line has been the finest instrumentality the United States has had in fighting foreign control of the West Indian trade. There has been much insidious propaganda against it, and these foreign lines have been most active in furthering this effort to kill it.

Visitors notice the prompt way in which they go through the quarantine, immigration, and customs vexations, and the exactness with which ship's officers predict departures. Shipmasters of all nationalities tell us there is nothing like it elsewhere. Ships are handled like clockwork, being allocated to a schedule, and going through the Canal like a train on a rail system. And in the meantime they can obtain many desired services — including ship's laundry, put ashore at the first terminus, completed and returned aboard at the opposite port; food supplies ordered at one port and assembled for lading at opposite port.

During the last three months of 1922 the Canal put through almost 10 commercial ships per day, and took in transit tolls over \$3,800,000, or at the rate of more than \$15,000,000 a year. The Canal has more than doubled its service in 8 years, in spite of the war and recent business depression. It can carry 4 or 5 times its present traffic without change, ex-

cept for a simple construction of additional water storage for dry-season use. It is now turning revenue in to nearly double operating costs, and when the time comes to enlarge its capacity, say 30 or 40 years hence, there is no reason why the work may not be entirely paid out of profits in operation during the enlargement period.

Commercially the Canal is more useful to the United States than to any other nation, and its greatest use is in our coast-to-coast trade. This trade continues to show a fine growth. The Canal is highly important also in the trade from Atlantic ports to the Far East, and in the trade to South America's west coast. As a factor in National defense the Canal is most valuable. And it is quite possible that but for the nitrates that were carried rapidly from Chile to factories in the United States and Europe the Allies might have lost the World War.

The Canal and the community connected with its operation are the finest expression of American thoroughness in engineering, public health, and community life that I have ever seen. The organization, I believe, in its outline and personnel is as effective and reliable as can be found in the world today. It is, whether people realize it or not, a model of sureness and efficiency, and an example to the world of the capacity of the American people. These are the verdicts passed on its work, not by the officials charged with its operation, but by practically every intelligent student of affairs who has observed its work. It furnishes living proof of the fact that government can conduct big business in a businesslike way if the executive branch will insist (as it has done) that the operation be kept free from improper political influences, and if the legislative branch will insist (as it has done) that we are not hampered by unnecessary legal restrictions. If the Canal cannot retain these advantages over some other of our Governmental business operations (and they will gradually be encroached upon if our vigilance is relaxed), then we can expect nothing else than a lapse into the inefficiency which now afflicts so many services. It is mainly with a view to enlisting the assistance of our people in averting this gradual encroachment on the efficiency of a work in which we all have pride that I have written this.

Science and Everyday Life

Condensed from The Saturday Evening Post (March 10)

Floyd W. Parsons

WHENEVER and wherever we develop one great new business, this always causes a rapid expansion in other industries closely related to the new enterprise. When we started building great numbers of automobiles, the manufacture of tires resulted in a large expansion of the markets for cotton. It is things like these that make the industrial development of the future beyond the understanding of even those possessed of unbridled imaginations. Here in the United States one new business is started every 25 minutes, and somebody invents something every 7 minutes.

Many people are working to obtain electricity from the sun. Others are trying to develop ways to insulate our houses, and if their efforts are successful the result will be a reduction of no less than one-third in our domestic fuel bills. We are informed that the present wasteful form of lighting will be supplanted by cold light, which will be 100 per cent more efficient, and which will make entire surfaces of ceilings and walls incandescent at will. We are assured that city dwellers will be able largely to dispense with cooking, for food will be served to many households in containers so constructed on the vacuum-bottle principle that they can remain on the kitchen shelves for days, and when opened their contents will be either piping hot or freezing cold. It is likely that we have already the elements for an invention whereby we shall be able to sit in our homes and witness plays and motion pictures as satisfactorily as we now do in the theatre. Now we can hear an orchestra or an actor through the use of radio; in the future we

shall be able to see the performers as well.

Already engineers are well on the way to the perfection of a method of cooling our homes in the summer from the same supply of gas used in the heating of them in the winter. The greatest work in which science is engaged is the unending search for new sources of power. Among the possibilities are plans for utilizing the internal heat of the earth by deep borings for steam production; the harnessing of the tides; the construction of boilers using solar heat, and the utilization of the internal energy of the atom. If this last aim is ever accomplished man will have opened up a source of power inconceivably greater than any possible requirement of the human race. We now recognize that concealed in matter of every kind are stores of energy immensely greater than those derived from chemical reactions such as the combustion of coal.

We are rapidly developing our knowledge of the sun, and making progress in finding the relationship between drought periods and the spots that appear on the sun at various intervals. All the records of our weather bureau are now being charted for the purpose of throwing light on this problem. It would be of great importance to agriculture if we were able to anticipate periods of serious drought. If we can establish rules covering the relationship of sun spots and drought periods, the accomplishment will be of great importance in making it possible to make long-range forecasts. It will soon be possible to answer questions of this kind definitely, because of the delicacy of heat and light measuring

instruments recently perfected. The electrical thermometer is now capable of detecting temperature changes of the millionth of a degree. It is even possible to estimate by means of a vacuum thermopile the infinitesimal amounts of heat that we receive from the stars. And speaking of stars, let us not forget that we now know that some of them are beyond our comprehension. The giant star Betelgeuse has a diameter of 260,000,000 miles; the earth's diameter is 8,000. This great star is equal to 27,000,000 suns like ours, and is big enough to contain many billion globes like the one we live on. And yet we look up at it and say, "Twinkle, twinkle, little star!"

We now have a gyro stabilizer that is designed to take the curse of seasickness out of ocean travel. This gyro consists of a balance wheel, spinning at high velocity and installed at the bottom of the ship near its center. When the revolving wheel is tipped out of the vertical, it sets up a strong resistance at right angles to the direction of the counter force. The weight of the gyro is only 1 per cent of that of the ship, but so great is the energy of the 100-ton rotating wheel, so complete is the vacuum in which it revolves, and so perfect are its bearings, that the gyro will run for four hours after the power has been shut off.

In practically every industry improved methods, new materials and novel discoveries are reducing the need for manual labor and increasing individual production. We have found that the ultra-violet rays of light can be employed to distinguish between cotton, wool and silk. German scientists have produced a colorless, odorless, liquid that will make wool mothproof without in any way changing or injuring the fabric. Crude rubber has been introduced into paper making to give a better product. As for new materials, the number is growing daily. A high-grade wax is

made from sugar cane. The tuber of the dahlia can be made to yield an exceptionally sweet sugar, said to be harmless to diabetics. A soap can be made from corn meal that will do away with stains on all kinds of fabrics. Experiments are being made in manufacturing the finest quality parchment paper from a Swiss plant that matures in three months. A mixture of sawdust and ashes now makes a splendid substitute for cardboard and wood. Boxes are made from it that are waterproof and fire-proof. This artificial wood is very cheap, will neither shrink nor expand, and it may be made as pliable as cardboard or as hard as oak. A low-priced substitute for hard rubber is made from corncobs. It is found that cotton stalks can be used successfully in paper making.

Perhaps the most important development in getting increased yields from the land is increasing the percentage of carbon in the atmosphere in which the plants grow. Hundreds of millions of cubic feet of carbonic acid gas escape into the air daily from ordinary furnaces, blast furnaces, cement works and other industrial plants. This gas can be piped out over the land and will lie close to the ground, not even being disturbed by ordinary winds. This air-fertilizing process has shown an increase in plant growth of from 50 to 250 per cent. One blast-furnace works, consuming 1100 tons of coal a day, develops enough carbonic acid to fertilize about 80,000 acres of potatoes. A large cement plant would be able to supply carbonic acid to fertilize about 30,000 acres. In an ordinary greenhouse the combustion gases coming from the heating furnace of the greenhouse can be used as a source of supply, furnishing all the carbonic acid needed.

The outlook is that from now on science will make life one unceasing revolution.

The Reader's Digest

Wild Chairmen I Have Met

Condensed from *Vanity Fair*

Stephen Leacock

LIKE all other people who speak much in public I have grown to have a fine taste in Chairmen. As soon as I shake hands with the Chairman, I can tell exactly how he will act. In the course of my pilgrimages I have been presented to the public by every known species and variety of chairman.

Everybody knows the chairman who says, "Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have not come here to listen to me; so I will be very brief; in fact, I will confine myself to just one or two very short observations." He then proceeds to make observations for 2*b* minutes. And at the end of it he remarks with charming simplicity, "Now I know that you are all impatient to hear the lecturer"—And everybody knows also the chairman who comes to the meeting with a very imperfect knowledge as to who or what the lecturer is, and is driven to introduce him by saying, "Our lecturer of the evening is widely recognized as one of the greatest authorities on,—on,—on his subject in the world today. He comes to us from,—from a great distance and I can assure him that it is a great pleasure to this audience to welcome a man who has done so much to,—to,—to advance the interests of,—of,—every-thing he has."

But this man, bad as he is, is not so bad as the chairman whose preparation for introducing the lecturer has obviously been made at the eleventh hour. I will remember one such. "I never saw the lecturer before," he said, "but I've read his book." (I have written 19 books). "The Committee was good enough to send me over his book last night. I didn't read it all, but I took a look at the preface and I can assure him he is very welcome. I understand he comes from a col-

lege,"—Then he turned towards me and said in a loud voice,—"What was the name of that college you said you came from?"

"McGill," I answered equally loud.

"He comes from McGill" — the Chairman boomed out. "I never heard of McGill myself, but I can assure him he's welcome. He's going to lecture to us on,—'What did you say it was to be about?'"

"It's a humorous lecture," I said.

"Ay, it's to be a humorous lecture, ladies and gentlemen, and I'll venture to say it will be a rare treat. I'm only sorry I can't stay for it myself, as I have to get back over to the Town Hall for a meeting. So without more ado, I'll get off the platform and let the lecturer go on with his humor."

A still more terrible type of chairman is the one whose mind is evidently preoccupied and disturbed with some local happening. He refers in moving tones to the local sorrow, whatever it is. As a prelude to a humorous lecture, this is not gay. Such a chairman fell to my lot in a London suburb. "As I look about this hall tonight," he began in a doleful whine, "I see many empty seats." Here he stifled a sob. "Nor am I surprised that a great many of our people should prefer tonight to stay quietly at home. To many it may seem hardly fitting that, after the loss our town has sustained, we should come out here to listen to a humorous lecture. We debated in our committee whether or not we should have the lecture. Had it been a lecture of another character our position might have been less difficult."

By this time I began to feel like a criminal.

"The case would have been different had the lecture been one that con-

tained information, or that was inspired by some serious purpose. But this is not so. We understand that this lecture which Mr. Leacock has already given, I believe 20 or 30 times in England—" Here he turned to me with a look of mild reproof while the silent audience, deeply moved, all looked at me as a man who went round the country insulting the memory of the dead by giving a lecture 30 times. "We understand, though, that we shall have an opportunity of testing for ourselves presently, that Mr. Leacock's lecture is not of a character which,—has not, so to speak, the kind of value,—in short is not a lecture of that class." Here he paused and choked back a sob.

"Had our poor friend been spared to us another six years, he would have rounded out the century. But it was not to be. For two or three years past he has noted that, somehow, his strength was failing, that, for some reason or other, he was no longer what he had been. Last month he began to droop. Last week he began to sink. Speech left him last Tuesday. This morning he passed, and he has gone now, we trust, in safety to where there are no lectures."

The audience was now nearly in tears. "But yet," continued the chairman, "our committee felt that in another sense it was our duty to go on with our arrangements. I will, therefore, invite Mr. Leacock to deliver to us his humorous lecture, the title of which I have forgotten, but I understand it to be the same lecture which he has already given 30 or 40 times in England."

But contrast with this the genial person who introduced me, all upside down, to a metropolitan audience. He was so neat, so brisk, so sure of himself that it didn't seem possible that he could make any kind of mistake. "It is a great pleasure,"—he said with a charming easy manner,— "to

welcome here our distinguished Canadian fellow citizen, Mr. Learoyd. There are many of us who have awaited Mr. Learoyd's coming with the most pleasant anticipations. We seemed, from his books, to know him already as an old friend. In fact, I think I do not exaggerate when I tell Mr. Learoyd that his name in our city has long been a household word. I have very, very great pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, in introducing to you Mr. Learoyd."

At the close of my lecture he said he was sure that the audience "were greatly indebted to Mr. Learoyd," etc.

Then there is the type of man who thinks that the fitting way to introduce a lecturer is to say a few words about the finances of the Society to which he is to lecture (for money) and about the difficulty in getting members to turn out to hear lectures. Such an introduction runs like this:

"Before introducing the speaker, I would like to say a few words. Many of the members are in arrears with their dues. They should remember that the fees asked by the lecturers have advanced very greatly in the last few years. In fact I may say they are becoming almost prohibitive. But fortunately two of our members subscribed ten pounds out of their own pockets, so we were able to raise the required sum. When we have members willing to make this sacrifice—because it is a sacrifice—we ought to support them. The members ought to think it their duty to turn out to the lectures, however hard it may be. I admit it is hard to turn out from the comfort of one's own fireside and come and listen to a lecture. But it should be a matter of duty towards this Society. But without more ado—oh! just one word more before I sit down, will all those who are leaving before the end of the lecture kindly go out through the side door and step as quietly as possible, Mr. Leacock."

The Reader's Digest

DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK (pp. 3, 13), of the First Presbyterian Church, New York City, has the greatest "pulling power" of any clergyman in America today. In addition, publishers have sold nearly one million copies of his books—the most popular of which is "The Meaning of Prayer."

JUSTICE JOHN H. CLARKE (p. 17) has recently resigned from the Supreme Court of the United States to devote his time and energies in behalf of the League of Nations.

HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN (p. 21) is President of the American Museum of Natural History, and **WILLIAM KING GREGORY** is Curator of the Department of Comparative Anatomy. Years of patient study and the expenditure of thousands of dollars have established at the American Museum of Natural History an entire gallery devoted to the Age of Man, the completion of which will present to the public the first scientifically exact panorama of the men of prehistoric ages that has ever been assembled. To make this project possible, there was necessary not only the cooperation of the principal museums of the world, but the employment of experts in the work of exploration all the way from the sands of Egypt to the tundras of the Arctic. The success of this project is one of the most significant accomplishments in the history of American science and the most conspicuous contribution yet made to the world's knowledge of the dawn of creation."

—McClure's Magazine.

GERTRUDE EMERSON (p. 39) is associate editor of "Asia."

BEN W. HOOPER (p. 53), former Governor of Tennessee, was appointed by President Harding to the United States Railroad Labor Board in 1921, and is its chairman. He has been Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and was the Republican nominee for United States Senator in 1916. His present article is the first of a series on Radicalism in America, by eminent authorities, to appear in successive numbers of The North American Review.

SETH K. HUMPHREY (p. 55) is the author of "The Racial Prospect," "Mankind," "The Indian Dispossessed," etc.

It is confidently believed that readers will assert that never before, within the pages of a single issue of any magazine, have so many notable articles been brought together as are contained in this issue of The Reader's Digest. A prominent business man of Trenton, New Jersey, thought so well of the February issue that he asked for ten extra copies to give to his friends. Many of your friends would, no doubt, be very grateful to you for introducing to them this unique time-saver. Will you be instrumental this month, therefore, in allowing at least one of your friends to avail himself of the coupon below—or its equivalent?

A convenient coupon for new subscribers

The Reader's Digest Association,

Floral Park, N. Y.

Pleasantville, New York

Enroll me to receive The Reader's Digest for one year,
beginning with the issue.

I enclose \$3.00 (full payment for 12 issues).

Name

Address

City and State

Who Reads "The Little Magazine?"

A nationally known Chautauqua lecturer and author writes from Maryland: "I recently returned from an extended lecture trip. On taking the train in Wichita, Kansas, and before the train started, a fine-appearing man stood by the seat back of me talking with two friends. With The Reader's Digest in hand, presently he said to them, 'Are you familiar with this? It is the best publication yet, a wonderful magazine, etc.' Under the circumstances I could not keep quiet. With a 'beg your pardon,' I had my say. Hope Kansas is honoring and helping itself by sending in thousands of subscriptions."

The President Emeritus of a prominent college on the Pacific Coast sends this comment: "The Digest suits my 'type of mind.' . . . A friend of mine, a famous D.D., once characterized one of his sermons as a 'baby,' and he said to cut the forty minutes to twenty by condensing would be too horrible to think of as it would 'mangle his baby.' He lost great pulpits because he did not know how to 'condense his baby.' Enclosed find check for \$3.00 because you have condensed five 'babies' I had seen before in extenso in about five times the space, and so far as I can see they are not mangled a little bit. Yours with great anticipation for the year."

The ex-President of an Eastern college, now doing important educational work in New York City, writes: "You certainly are doing a fine piece of work through your Reader's Digest, which I read from cover to cover."

In sending in her renewal, a woman in Philadelphia says: "The Digest is the best paper that comes to our house. Two very learned men last week asked me if I knew of it. I told them I was a Charter Member."

A woman from Iowa writes: "I have come across your publication on the library table of a learned gentleman. Why don't you advertise yourselves? My hasty glances promised a splendid treat in your pages, and I think you have a unique and much-needed thing."

Accompanying his renewal, a Y. M. C. A. Secretary of Ohio, adds this note: "I am a charter subscriber to The Digest, and I must say that I consider it the best magazine that comes to my desk."

A city pastor of Alabama sends us a long list of friends whom he wants to have know of the Digest, and writes: "I wish to thank you most heartily for the splendid service you are rendering. . . . I am indeed disappointed that the files for last year are depleted, as I had planned to have all the issues in order that I might have a complete file for permanent reference. I want you to know that I consider you are doing one of the finest pieces of work for the Clergy that I have ever known of. With the very best of all good wishes for your success."